

SOCIAL STUDIES OF TODAY

BOOKS BY HUGO MÜNSTERBERG

Psychology and Life, Boston, 1899
Grundzüge der Psychologie, Leipzig, 1900
American Traits, Boston, 1902
Die Amerikaner, Berlin, 1904
Principles of Art Education, New York, 1905
The Eternal Life, Boston, 1905
Science and Idealism, Boston, 1906
Philosophie der Werte, Leipzig, 1907
On the Witness Stand, New York, 1908
Aus Deutsch-Amerika, Berlin, 1908
The Eternal Values, Boston, 1909
Psychotherapy, New York, 1909
Psychology and the Teacher, New York, 1910
American Problems, New York, 1910
Psychologie und Wirtschaftsleben, Berlin, 1912
Vocation and Learning, St. Louis, 1912
Psychology and Industrial Efficiency, Boston, 1913
American Patriotism, New York, 1913

SOCIAL STUDIES
OF
TODAY
BY
HUGO MÜNSTERBERG

T. FISHER UNWIN
LONDON: ADELPHI TERRACE
LEIPSIC: INSELSTRASSE 20
1913

Copyright in the United States of America
BY MOFFAT, YARD AND COMPANY

¶

HUGO REISINGER

CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
1. AMERICAN PATRIOTISM	3
2. THE EDUCATIONAL UNREST	25
3. THE CASE OF THE REPORTER	61
4. THE GERMANY OF TO-DAY	83
5. THE GERMAN WOMAN	119
6. COEDUCATION	149
7. HOUSEHOLD SCIENCES	169
8. THE GERMANS AT SCHOOL	193
9. PSYCHOLOGY AND THE NAVY	225

AMERICAN PATRIOTISM

AMERICAN PATRIOTISM

WHEN Harvard University had sent me abroad for a year as Exchange Professor to lecture in Berlin on psychology and philosophy, I always felt that I should not be living up to the real meaning of my mission if I did not do my best also to spread on the European continent reasonable ideas about true Americanism. Indeed plenty of absurd ideas prevail there. Hence whenever associations or universities abroad invited me to give general addresses, I laid aside my psychology and philosophy and preached America. I tried to overcome prejudices and to foster healthy sympathy. I spoke of American progress and achievements, of American art and literature, of American education and scholarship, as well as of my favorite topic, the American woman; and whenever a trump was needed, I became enthusiastic over American patriotism.

I believe sincerely that no European country knows a patriotism of such fervor and explosiveness. The foreigner who approaches the land gets a foretaste on shipboard. He may have heard the "Marseillaise," or "God Save the King," or "Deutschland, Deutsch-

land über Alles," or the "Russian Hymn," sung by deeply devoted masses; but when at the captain's dinner on the steamer the band plays Dixie, a frenzy breaks into the feast such as he has never seen in the Old World. There is something jubilant and something final in American patriotism, and every outsider must feel what a tremendous power for the good of the country is generated by such triumphant confidence.

There is indeed nothing nobler than patriotism, if it is well understood. It means the unflinching belief that our country has a mission of its own, that the nation can do something in the world which no other people on the globe can do in exactly the same way and that we are willing to give our best in order that this unique purpose be nobly fulfilled. Patriotism does not demand ill feeling toward our neighbors or lack of respect for anyone or an air of superiority. It stands in sharp contrast only to the flabby cosmopolitanism which believes that a vague ideal of general humanity makes all the boundary lines of nations rather superfluous. Patriotism is the zeal to help in working out the characteristic, individual tendency of one's own nation, so that it can play its unique rôle. The last few decades have been filled with such patriotic striving all over the earth. The idea of nationality has forced itself to the foreground with unprecedented energy in the last half century. After the small, weak German

and Italian states were united into the new Germany and the new Italy, with all the strength of the new unity grew a splendid patriotism which asserted the rights and the hopes of the German and the Italian nations. When Japan became aware of its power, when China awoke, when Russia felt its wounds healing, new patriotic inspirations filled the world, and the tremendous force of old England and the glory of chivalrous France have never lacked the splendor of the patriotic emotion. Everywhere this belief in the world task of compatriots became the yeast in the nations. It gave rise to every memorable achievement.

Yet no other nation has so much needed high-strung patriotic emotion for the fulfilment of its mission as America. None has combined such a number of different races and naturally divergent elements. Only a passionate patriotism could hold them together to secure a unity of convictions and actions. None has had to work out its destiny on such a gigantic area, with such intense contrasts of local conditions, of economic demands and of cultural level. Only an unquestioning patriotism could make the millions forget their provincialisms and weld them into a world power; but, whatever the social necessities for this national over-emotion may have been, it stands out as an inspiring symptom of American idealism. A peo-

ple that loves its country with such exuberance must have a heart and a mind open to anything for which enthusiasm may be worth while.

When I spoke in Europe this was the whole of my story. I did not care to add there that a disproportionate part of this fine American patriotism draws its strength from a glaring ignorance of the rest of the world. This instinctive feeling has never impressed itself so strongly upon me as since my return. The typical American does not know and does not care to know Europe, with the exception of England, the "mother country." To be sure, it may be granted that a high-strung patriotism in days of conflicts and excitement demands a certain unfair prejudice against all other lands. "My country, right or wrong!" ought to remain superior to all others; but happily there is no struggle and no excitement now, and the quiet days rather invite fairness and expansive interest.

There was also once a time when the Americans naturally took an unfriendly attitude toward the older nations as a kind of defense against their ill-tempered haughtiness. But that belongs to a distant past — for a long while the great nations have welcomed the United States as an equal and have held open to her a place in the front rank. The American ignorance as to Europe which prevails to-day is simply carelessness and a poor habit, like bad spelling or shiftless arithmetic.

tic. For most Americans, the ignorant indifference as to Europe no longer grows from their prejudices; the prejudices grow from their indifference. They do not take any trouble to inform themselves. If they know their own country and reserve for England a certain respectful interest, they feel that everything is all right. Too few begin to feel that such a platform of the modern Know-Nothing party is, after all, impossible at a time when the United States has become a world power, the serious needs of which demand most subtle adjustment to the events of the globe.

The whole misery of the situation discloses itself in the kind of news which the American papers print about the European continent. There is no lack of material, and the sensation of the day is cabled with such an abundance of detail that at least the reader of the large and leading papers has a general feeling that he is getting plenty of information from Rome and Constantinople, from Paris and St. Petersburg. It is only necessary, however, to sift all this news for some months, as a scholarly historian would sift his material, and the vague admiration for the cable expenses of the newspapers soon turns into a sincere pity for the misinformed reader. I took considerable pains during a whole year to study the international news on both sides of the ocean. For instance, with the help of able assistants, I examined carefully the number of

lines devoted to American news in certain important European papers and to continental European news in leading American papers. From the mere counting of the quantities we went on to a detailed analysis, comparing so far as possible the so-called facts, which the American correspondents in Europe confided to the wires, with the actual events as they were known on those same dates to the careful peruser of European journals—and vice versa. There was no reason to be proud of the achievements of the European papers. Their so-called information too often emphasized the sensational. Yet their work appeared almost like a thorough study compared with the looseness and carelessness with which European news was gathered for the customers on Broadway. The most trivial incidents were picked up and magnified into important events, and happenings of momentous consequence were ignored; the facts themselves were distorted because essential features were carelessly omitted and their connections were presented with the irresponsibility of gossip. Of course the American reader is beyond the stage in which everything printed is taken as true, but whatever is cabled still comes to him with a certain right to be believed. After those months of serious inquiry, I am sure the pictures the American reader accepts as exact photographic reproductions are on the whole hasty sketches by careless and often un-

skillful draftsmen, poorly suited to the American of to-day. True patriotism cannot demand that the great historical movements in foreign lands be pushed into shady corners of the press reports to keep unlimited room on the sunny side of the newspapers for the homemade murder trials and ward-politics.

But the newspapers are after all only one element in the relations between civilized nations. We are so proud of the international character of our art and science, and all the cultural and social endeavors of mankind; we are too little aware that this internationalism can easily lead to chaos if it is not planfully directed and supervised. We no longer travel in mail-coaches and sailing-boats from land to land, and yet we too easily forget that the intellectual intercourse of the nations also demands ever new modernizations. If left to the casual and haphazard influences of mere commercial interests, even those cultural values may be of little avail for making the nations of the earth really acquainted with one another.

I have tried systematically to study the selection of European books that have appeared in translation on the American market. The result gave me a pitiful showing, as much by the glaring omissions in the list as by the preposterous inclusions. This seems to be true of the literature of all countries as far as I was able to discover. Often a book finally lands in America

when it has become entirely antiquated at home and has lost all significance for the country in which it originated. The German book which stirred some leading critics most deeply this year, and was accepted as the last symptom of German movements, produced the same heat of emotion a decade ago in the Fatherland and there has long been covered with dust. It is well known that the persistent efforts of a few great art dealers have created in the American market a monopoly for French paintings through artificially awakening a taste, then a fashion and finally a craving for an art which originally did not lie at all in the line of American instincts. In a similar way accidental factors have determined the most recent prevalence of Italian opera in the operatic life of the nation. It is to a high degree just as accidental that in the field of scholarship Germany was for a long while the only place of pilgrimage for American students. At the same time America herself does not make any effort to bring to the other nations her own spiritual products. From Paris to Moscow, the bookstores have almost given up the effort to import American books when their customers order them. They feel utterly helpless; they do not know how to reach the American publishers, who do not take the slightest trouble to accommodate themselves to European needs.

These questions of arbitrariness and prejudices in

the cultural field are so earnestly before my mind, because I devoted much time during my exchange year to the organization of a new institute in Berlin, which was crystallized about such interests: the "Amerika-Institut." Its purpose was to further and to expand the cultural relation between the United States and Germany. This sounds almost trivial, and it appears as if just this labor were being performed in many places. But in the whole history of civilization probably no such enterprise has ever been recorded, and what it aims at may truly be the model for future developments. It works for the necessary modernization of international intercourse, a kind of efficiency management in the world of ideals. The relations of civilized countries have always been carefully organized in political, legal and economic affairs, but in the field of education and scholarship, art and literature, moral and social purposes, the international exchange is nothing but disorder. Energies are wasted, efforts are scattered, the cheapest elements often rush into the foreground, the best impulses remain inhibited; in short, disorganization prevails. The purpose of this new German institute is to improve the situation so far as Germany and America are concerned, helping and adjusting and harmonizing the scattered efforts which have arisen and may arise on both sides of the ocean.

Our modern civilization demands such systematic help in the field of unpolitical and uncommercial endeavors, but this effort of Germany must be only the beginning. If the value of the principle is once recognized, it must lead further. On the one side, Germany must develop similar institutes for the relations to all the other civilized nations; on the other side, all the great countries must create such institutes of cultural organization for their own exchange with the important peoples of the globe. All the nations will then become interrelated in their cultural work as they are related politically by the diplomatic agencies; but none would gain more through such national establishments than the United States, in which, as I have insisted, the cultural relations to the leading fellow countries are more accidental and disorganized than any great European country would tolerate. True patriotism cannot possibly demand that the nation care for nothing from foreign countries except what comes drifting on the waves of chance.

It appears strange that there is no more intimate acquaintance when we consider how many thousands of American tourists land every summer in Cherbourg and Rotterdam, in Hamburg and Bremen, in Naples and Genoa. Yet is their method, and still more their attitude in traveling, really adapted to ideal purposes? To be sure, most of them look on it as a gaudy vaca-

tion. They have an "awfully good time" or they are "terribly bored"; but in any case they do not feel obliged to make deep researches and sociological investigations or to work hard as unofficial delegates of their country for the cultivation of international friendship. Of course no one demands that from them. And yet everyone who travels is practically a kind of unofficial delegate of his nation, and has a certain influence on the general relations of the peoples. Moreover, though he may be out only for irresponsible fun the traveler gathers information after all and picks up impressions; and they help to shape the views of his fellow-countrymen. Everything that he might gain and achieve is spoiled from the start if he comes with the wrong attitude.

There are plenty of exceptions, but the great mass of American travelers nowadays go through Europe with a social haughtiness and an air of superiority which practically preclude a sympathetic understanding of the national life about them. No doubt they like quite well the quaint old towns and the mediæval architecture, but the people who live there are considered more or less as stage supernumeraries whom the countries must keep in order that visitors may get a romantic impression. The mountains in Switzerland are delightful, but the inhabitants, of course, are only waiters and curiosity dealers. Everyone enjoys the picture

galleries of Italy, but the Italians are just good enough to kneel picturesquely in their old churches.

More than four decades have passed since Lowell wrote, not without resentment, his famous essay "On a Certain Condescension in Foreigners." The tables have been entirely turned. The most touchy American may be satisfied with the admiration that Europe has for the strong side of this great republic and with the unspoken flattery which it offers by its overzealous imitation. Those thousands of American tourists who flit through the older lands in their automobiles find nothing but deference among the foreigners with whom they come in contact. It is the average European who to-day gets the taste of a certain condescension in foreigners who hang small silk flags with the Stars and Stripes out of their hotel windows. They come with their minds made up that Italians do not know how to cook and that their railways are intolerable for a decent American; that the French are perverse in their morality and that they never take a bath; and that the Germans have no other thoughts than lager beer and the policeman—in short they look on continental Europeans with about that wisdom with which the man on Broadway sometimes speaks of Bostonians when he grins and simply says: "Baked Beans!"

Whatever improvements are made in those obsolete countries seem to them to have resulted not from

general progress but from the natural desire to satisfy the well-tipping tourist. They have no idea in what a wonderful rhythm of internal development the leading countries of the European continent are moving on the common road of social ideals. They do not see how much in the labor movement, how much in the struggles for women and children, how much in the educational world, how much in the civil service and in a thousand other fields, would be suggestive and helpful — yes, truly inspiring — to the American who would come not to look down but to take part in a sympathetic mood. It is simply depressing to find out on the returning steamer what third-class opinions these first-class passengers have really brought home. True patriotism cannot possibly demand that the American visit foreign lands with his purse open, but with his eyes shut.

Is not this condescension to foreigners even a part of the political creed of the American on the street? The old stump speaking on the rotten monarchies of Europe has probably died out; but when the average politician scrambles for some reasons why the Monroe Doctrine ought to be upheld, he will not forget the moral argument that the governmental system of the republics stands on a level much higher than that of those monarchies which are seeking a foothold in South America. Fortunately there is at present no state in

Europe which has the remotest idea of violating the traditional Monroe Doctrine; but comparison of the sham principles of some of those operetta republics with the ethical values of the historic monarchies is worse than bad politics — it is bad education.

Can it be denied that even all the modern discussions on peace and disarmament, on arbitration treaties and the causes of righteous wars, get a good deal of their steam from the confident belief that it is the duty and mission of America to be the preceptor of Europe in the department of higher morality? Arbitration treaties seem welcome to the whole nation, and certainly a number of the friends of peace believe in them without restriction; but so much has surely been shown by the discussion — the crowd considers them welcome only up to the point where, according to their feeling, fighting is necessary after all. Hardly any American doubts that no written arbitration treaty would hinder the American nation from fighting against any European country if it believed that its just interests were at stake.

In other words, the Americans take it for granted that, whatever agreements may be made, American public opinion must remain the supreme judge of the world's affairs. For this reason, in fact, not a few attack such treaties as necessarily insincere and proclaim that just wars ought not to be suppressed, and that a

righteous war in a good cause may be better than a peaceful endurance of injustice; but is there not lurking behind this argument too the feeling of national superiority? In modern times the dire burden of war does not fall upon nations because there is justice on the one side and injustice on the other. The ultimate pretext for the war may be some quarrel which might be looked on as if right must be with the one party and wrong with the other; but what boots the pretext? The powder barrel that explodes is war, and not the match that sets it off.

War finds its natural condition when the wholesome growth of two rivals has reached a point at which there is no longer any room for the expansion of both. If two men love the same girl, there is no chance for a compromise and for arbitration, nor is there justice with the one and injustice with the other. Japan was in the right and Russia was in the right too—or rather the question of right and wrong was not involved when the two giants were wrestling for supremacy in the East. If England's and Russia's national interests conflicted in Asia, no concert of nations would have a moral right to say that either side is wrong. Any judgment of this kind would be an answer to a meaningless question. What a lack of historical perspective in those bitter denunciations with which the editorials of the American papers accompanied the

various phases of the Balkan War. The American public played the grand jury before which Austria had to defend itself, when it was about to "rob" Servia of the fruits of victory. True patriotism cannot demand from Americans that they flourish the big stick across the Atlantic.

Is not this careless, haughty, condescending, unfair behavior toward the European nations ultimately the residue of a patriotic view that really already belongs to the past? While all this unfriendliness survives, can it be overlooked that recent times have slowly changed American ideas as to their own national life? The American nation has grown up with the idea that it is an English nation and that, just as its language is English, its life character and its heart's blood are Anglo-Saxon too. The Anglo-Saxon is the true American, England is the country of kinship; the immigrants who come from other countries are useful fellow workers and desirable guests, but they remain guests and the countries from which they are derived remain foreign countries. They may be the home countries of the guests, but no ties of kinship connect the countries with the American nation. Has the American nation, however, really any need for persistently ignoring the fact that this whole theory is an artificial construction based on an untenable illusion?

Malicious critics of Europe like to present the na-

tional life over there as if all were held together by willful theories of the aristocratic classes forced on the suggestible masses and finally accepted by them with enthusiastic ignorance; what must be said then of the dogma preached by an aristocratic minority of the country here, through which the non-Anglo-Saxon majority is delegated to the position of guests and hyphenated citizens? The Irish and the Scotch, the Germans and the Dutch, the Danish and the Swedish, the Austrians and the Italians, the French and the Russians, have heard the story believably for a long while; but finally their patience has come to an end and their non-English consciousness has awakened. They have studied the history of their ancestors in this country and have become proud of their contributions to the development of this great nation. They have discovered how the traditions of the schoolbooks and the teachings of public opinion unfairly and grotesquely ignore that wonderful coöperation and they suddenly feel like children who discover that the story of the stork will not do, after all.

Those seventeen million German-Americans, for instance, know that the blood of their ancestors was offered for the unity of this nation; that the brawn and the brain of their fathers helped to build its prosperity; that their education and their character have given tremendous momentum to the glorious work of the peo-

ple, and that they themselves are just as good American citizens as the Anglo-Americans. Those Germans who sought their homes in Pennsylvania in the seventeenth century are to the millions of modern German-Americans what the Pilgrim Fathers are to those descended from English stock. The time has passed when the children felt ashamed that their parents were not of English but of Teutonic origin. They know that the statue of Steuben in Washington is not only the monument to the great teacher of Washington's army but a symbol in the national capitol of the incessant service which German teachers and soldiers, builders and farmers, have rendered to all parts of the land. They feel with indignation that the American history taught in the little schoolhouse is a fabrication in which not only all gratitude but even the most modest acknowledgment for the abundant aid of the German pioneers to American civilization is left out. Exactly the same change has come to all the other peoples. The one man who is the idol of the nation has never lost a chance to tell how Dutch and Scotch and Irish and French blood is mixed in his veins.

This new feeling and attitude of the majority necessarily demand a fundamental revision of the antiquated national theory. The American people is not an English, nor a Dutch, nor a French, nor a German, nor an Irish people. The American nation is an entirely new

people which, like all the other great nations of the world, has arisen from a mixture of races and from a blending of nationalities. The ties of kinship do not connect it with England more than with Ireland or Holland or Germany or Sweden. All these races are united and assimilated here—not by a common racial origin, but by a common national task. They must work out in unity the destiny of a nation to which all the leading countries of Europe have contributed their most enterprising elements as bearers of their particular traits and ideals. A new patriotism has sprung up that does not aim toward the conservation of an English people, but hopes for the highest development of a unique nation in which the finest qualities of all Europe will be blended.

This new patriotism alone can be a true stimulus to all the healthy elements in this great country. The old kind of patriotism has been really holding back the non-English elements, as it forced on them the artificial task of imitating something which was not in harmony with their inmost nature. The new patriotism inspires everyone to his duty of contributing the very best of the ideals of his home country to the happiness of the whole. The new patriotism of to-morrow will not know hosts or guests among the citizens of this country. The nation is one solid whole; and whatever European country has contributed to its inheritance

must have its share in the gratitude of every inhabitant.

The Irish- or Dutch- or Swedish- or German- or French-American would be utterly ungrateful if he were to forget how endlessly much England has given to this nation which is now his own. And the Anglo-American would be no less ungrateful if he were to forget what the European continent has poured out for the strength and the beauty and the blessing of his beloved land. Since the people with all the manifoldness of elements feel themselves one, the nation cannot have a diversity of ancestors — all Europe is the mother country. To see this mother country's achievements will be every American's pride, to visit its soil will be his inspiration — the intercourse will never be without respect and even the rivalry never without sympathy. The Anglo-American resentment of yesterday and the condescension of to-day toward continental Europe will yield to friendship. True patriotism cannot demand that the American people draw apart and fall asunder when their hearts turn lovingly to their ancestral homes. There ought not to be civil war on the battlefields of European memories.

THE EDUCATIONAL UNREST

This essay first appeared in the Metropolitan Magazine

THE EDUCATIONAL UNREST

UNREST is life. There could be nothing worse for our schools and colleges and universities than a general feeling of satisfaction with that which has been accomplished. Educational stagnation would certainly be the beginning of educational decay. We need the experimenting even if some reforms do not reform, we need the discussions, we need the grumbling, and indeed, we may be satisfied even with the dissatisfaction. But what is desirable in the conflict of opinion is a certain clearness as to the issues. If too much is merely left to vague instincts, there is too little chance for systematic progress; the efforts are made in a haphazard way. There must be fighting, but the fighters ought to see with open eyes against whom they are lined up. The discussions do not become efficient as long as there is no practical platform. We must recognize the chief principles in order to understand the apparently chaotic tendencies and cross-purposes in the educational impulses of the time. Where ought we to start in order to discover the essen-

tial needs of our time? Ought we to begin at the bottom or at the top, at the elementary schools or at the universities?

Many millions go to the ordinary schools, while only a handful can afford to go to the highest seats of learning. Accordingly, it seems as if our interest ought to be centered on the needs of these millions, and as if it would be snobbish if the chief attention were given to those who can attain the highest advantages of educational development. If we have good schools, the health and progress of the nation seems secure, and it appears therefore secondary to ask for the best conditions under which the universities may flourish. Yet this may be a treacherous delusion. Of course, if we have good schools much may be gained. But the question is what we mean by good schools; perhaps just this problem cannot be solved rightly unless it is constantly controlled by the life concerns of the highest institutions. The history of civilization shows indeed that the educational ideals of a country are always shaped by the demands and ideals and inspirations of the most advanced and highest institutions. It is superficial to think that mere common sense can determine the standards for the education of the masses, since this so-called common sense is nothing but the outcome of the hardest and highest thought among the deepest thinkers of the nation. The stream of ideas never flows upward;

its source always springs from the height of the noblest minds.

Even in the most external way we see how the educational principles work downward. The students of the universities become the teachers and supervisors of the schools and carry the impulses which they received in academic halls to the schoolrooms of the country. Moreover, the entrance conditions of the higher institutions set the goals for the lower ones, and the raising of their level has been the chief cause of the improvement of the high schools. But the internal influences are much more important. Any poor fad at the universities soon distorts the elementary class work. Any new deep insight in the colleges brings blessings to hundreds of thousands of schoolrooms. The real ambitions and hopes of education are controlled and can be measured by the spirit of its most prominent and highest institutions. All this is finally true of every sphere of national activity. The business life of the country ultimately gains its character from the largest economic forces. The few great corporations and not the millions of small stores are shaping the commercial ideas of the land, and even in the field of moral virtues it is a mistake to believe that it can be otherwise. We have heard an exceptional man hammering into the masses the tempting doctrine that the exceptional man does not count and that the virtues of

the millions alone are deciding the fate of the nation. Yet Roosevelt's sermon is less than half of the story, as it is not true that these masses ever develop virtuous lives without the inspiration of great leaders, who have new visions of human duties and human ideals and new strength for imparting them. If we want to decide what kind of studies and what kind of methods, what kind of teachers and what kind of pupils, are to be preferred, let us by all means see clearly what is needed for the best work at the top. If the right spirit prevails there, it will work down and bring the greatest efficiency and wholesomeness to the work of the village schools.

We must therefore consider first the battles which are raging on the university grounds. We may begin with the most natural question — what kind of studies are to be pursued? Here we do not care for the details; we only want to see the great party divisions. Of course they are nowhere acknowledged as such, but the observer ought to recognize the antagonism of the underlying forces, even if externally some compromise has been effected. To be sure, there cannot be much difference of opinion regarding professional schools for the expert. The lawyer has to study law, the physician medicine, the minister divinity, the engineer technology. There the choice of studies is essentially a practical one and while it is true that in those special fields also op-

posing ideas as to the order of studies and the methods can be traced and are important, yet great educational principles are less involved. It is quite different in the sphere of the college. Commencement speeches and inauguration addresses have often drawn the attention of wider circles to the collegiate unrest. If we are to group the often chaotic tendencies and the often accidental changes under two great principles, we may say that it is a fight between cultural education and professional education in college.

Now at first we do not want to take sides; we want to understand the issues in a neutral spirit and so we may approach the antithesis here and further on with the best will to see the good features on both sides. The aim of those who believe in the cultural purpose of college studies is to keep professionalism as far as possible from the academic halls. The college graduates, men or women, may enter into any sphere of professional activity, may seek their way to the law school or medical school, may go to the banking house or to the factory, may go into domestic activity or into public life, but they ought to devote their years of collegiate life to a work which secures the harmonious growth of their minds. Those who can devote the years of adolescence to their intellectual development and who are not obliged to go from the school straight to the market-places of the world ought to spend this happy

time in the service of true culture in order to prepare themselves for highest efficiency. They ought to secure a common possession of ideals before they are separated by the needs of the various practical activities.

Two demands are paramount for the interest of the nation. The mind ought to be trained to highest efficiency and the individual ought to come into the broadest possible contact with the world. If the mind is really trained to efficiency, it will master any task which the practical life may set later on. The mind must be schooled to exert serious effort, must become able to hold the important and to dismiss the trivial, and to approach any problem in the right spirit. On the other hand, he who goes out into the world must have reached the point where nothing human is foreign to his interest and where everything is seen in its correct perspective.

This aim leads to two important principles in the selection of studies. In order to secure the right approach and thus to prepare the mind to take the most efficient attitude toward whatever life may bring, the college must insist on a certain concentration of studies. Each student must learn to do one thing well. He must not be allowed to scatter his work in an irresponsible way but must be held to one consistent plan in which a large part of his work is grouped around one

center. But in order to bring to everyone the fullest acquaintance with the manifoldness of that which will surround him, the college must insist on a certain expansion of studies. The work in the college years must not be too one-sided; it must be distributed over all important fields. It will not do for a young man or a young woman to go through college and bring home nothing but a smattering of knowledge from a score of fields, studying merely the beginnings of a large number of unrelated sciences without going to real depths in any. But it is no less intolerable for those four years to be devoted exclusively to chemistry or to Sanscrit while the world around is forgotten. It may be difficult to find the right balance between this demand for concentration and the demand for expansion. And to a certain degree it may be arbitrary to decide how much shall belong to that central field and how much to the periphery, but certainly everyone ought to become seriously interested in one subject and yet gain an acquaintance with natural sciences and historical sciences, with mathematics and philosophy, with languages and literature, with economics and government. Such collegiate years would furnish a true education in which every motive of commercialism and professionalism is kept entirely in the background.

The other side opposes such cultural ideals with serious arguments and with unserious ridicule. They say

the nation cannot afford to waste the best years of the young men and women in useless, unpractical engagements. All that kind of cultural education ought to be brushed away and may be left to the private finishing schools for fashionable young ladies. The college is not a country club where young men are to amuse themselves without any thought of their future practical responsibilities; the college is not for the idle sons of rich parents who spend their years in preparing themselves for nothing in particular. The struggle for existence is sharp and every hour ought to be devoted to preparation for the life task. Moreover, if the mind is to grow, it can grow only in freedom. All coercion ought to be foreign to academic life. Let everyone develop in the direction of his strongest impulse and instead of demanding that he scatter his studies over large, expanded fields give him the fullest chance to choose what harmonizes best with his natural gifts which he ought to strengthen for his later practical work.

Thus the professionalist who makes his case against the culturist also has two fundamental demands. Against the wish for concentration and expansion he puts the claim for useful election and for unrestricted liberty. If a young man is to enter the medical school, let him not lose any day of his college years in other than naturalistic studies; let him spend his time in the

biological and chemical laboratories, but do not let him throw away his time on history of Greek art and Italian literature, on logic or political economy. But above all give him the fullest opportunity to follow his personal inclination. His instincts will tell him best what he needs. Liberty is the atmosphere for intellectual progress. Only if he is unhampered by the traditional demands for distributed studies can he reach out for the greatest mastery in his chosen field.

This struggle has found characteristic expression in the academic movements of the last few years. Even in the same institutions some changes may point in the one, some in the other direction, because the partisans of the one or the other side are often together in the same faculty room. Unless all signs are misleading it may be said that just now the professionalists are on the retreat and the culturists advancing. It is characteristic that the oldest and most influential university of the land, which has led in the struggle for free election of courses, under its new administration has turned toward a firm demand for systematic regulation of studies, insisting both on concentration and on expansion. Concentration must not be misinterpreted to mean a preparatory focusing on the future life work. On the contrary, the new leader of Harvard University emphasized only recently that the future lawyer ought to study history or economics, not because law demands

history, but just because law with its strictly logical aims stands so far away from history. No one can overlook the great value which the freedom of election had for the development of the higher studies, but no one can ignore the further fact that it was indeed high time to check this unrestricted freedom. That which was intended as liberty approached anarchy. Instead of the expected development of the personal powers, we saw simply a flabby preference for the paths of least resistance; instead of years of training the college time became for too many a period in which the power of energetic mental work became enervated by lack of use and a habit of superficiality developed.

Concentrated studies alone demand systematic effort, and without insistence on such concentration, too large a number will miss this greatest opportunity for real training. On the other hand, it was just the conscientious and industrious man who was naturally and almost necessarily inclined to concentrate too much and to concentrate on those subjects which he believed to be useful for his practical life purposes. The result was that sad product of our modern universities, the uneducated expert. It is a happy turn when public opinion begins to demand again that the broadest possible culture be the basis of the life work for those who are to lead the masses. Yes, it was not difficult to discover that the building up of professionalism and expert work on the

ground of expanded knowledge is ultimately also the most practical scheme. The young man who enters even the business office with a broad college education of rich cultural character may in the first year stand behind the boy who got his office training immediately after the high school, but a few years later he will have surpassed him, and experience shows that the modern conditions of life tend more from year to year to make this success probable. The expert work belongs to the graduate departments of the university. The highest completion of his intellectual work the teacher finds in the graduate schools, the professional man in the professional schools, the business man in the commercial schools and schools for business administration, the technical man in the graduate departments for applied science. But after all, the college can give to everyone its very best by a training in concentrated effort and attention and by widening the mental horizon.

The same antithesis goes through the whole school life and as soon as we have weighed the advantages and disadvantages of the opposing views on the college level, we can recognize more clearly the values of the corresponding tendencies in the high schools and even in the primary schools. On the surface here too, it may appear as if all the right is on the side of those who demand that the youth of the nation be prepared for practical life work as early as possible. The funds of the

community should not be wasted on luxuries; the useful studies ought to prevail. And again there goes hand in hand with this demand the further wish that the pupil select with full freedom those studies which harmonize with his inclinations. Why teach the boy who is to become a farmer anything about antiquity instead of about cattle and wheat? Why burden the future business man with literature instead of bookkeeping? Often indeed it appears as if for those who argue on this side culture is to be subdivided into agriculture, horticulture and similar divisions.

But the shortsightedness of all such views quickly shows itself. The community has found out that such schemes may be well fitted to give the children a good time in school but lead them to a bad time afterward. Life is hard work and if they have never learned in school to give their concentrated attention to that which does not appeal to them and which does not interest them immediately, they have missed the most valuable lesson of their school years. The little practical information they could have learned at any time: the energy of attention and concentration can no longer be learned if the early years are wasted. However narrow and commercial the standpoint which is chosen may be, it can always be found that it is the general education which pays best, and the more the period of cultural work can be expanded the more efficient will

be the services of the school for the practical purposes of the nation. The schools which cater to the demand for direct practical usefulness become trivial, and those which are subservient to the demand for unrestricted freedom become overwhelmed with fads and fancies. The youths who leave such schoolrooms are unprepared for the real duties of life. Their attention is turning to everything which appeals to the lower instincts. The big headlines within and without the newspapers hold their mind. There is no hope of serious resistance to the temptations of life. Truly the best interests of the nation can be secured only if the school most earnestly follows the lead of the new tendencies in university life. School work also fulfills its highest purpose only if it aims toward a training of the mind in concentrated effort and toward a widening of the mind by a sympathetic interest in all the ideal purposes of humanity. The authority of the school with its serious discipline must remove that spirit of go-as-you-please and the belief in the ideal values of culture must fill even the humblest classroom, if the child is to be well prepared for the turmoil of the market.

It is curious to see in recent days how much this discussion of culture and professionalism has gone over into an entirely different discussion. The question what kind of studies are desirable in the colleges has

been turned into the question: what kind of students do we want to see there? For whom are the college halls built? For the few or for the masses? But this antithesis may take many forms. It may easily be expressed in such a form that no reasonable observer can doubt that a preference for the few means destruction of the college spirit. The college is not a place for a social aristocracy, is not a club for rich boys and famous athletes, who look down upon the modest "grinds" and the poor men's sons. It is with full justice that some university presidents have recently turned with vigor against the overwhelming influence of the social clubs and against their snobbish isolation. Life at large throws together many kinds of men. It is not desirable for the college to create artificial conditions in favor of stronger lines of demarcation instead of doing its best to see that just at the period of college life most different types come into intimate contact on an equal level. The college ought to stand against prejudice and narrowness.

But all this is very different from the antithesis of the few and the many, if by the few are meant the men with exceptional gifts and superior powers. Certainly in recent years the feeling has grown that our university system is too much adapted to the average man who does not want to be anything but average, and that this satisfaction with the commonplace is unfair to the

interests of those who promise the most for the national future. There is no doubt that much in the to and fro movements of our university life to-day is caused by this fear and by the opposition to it. A characteristic symptom is the struggle about the method of instruction. There are teachers who would like to perform all the university work in very small classes, if possible always with a few men, under strictest control of the instructor, thus bringing every individual under the sharpest supervision and making sure that everybody is doing exactly the prescribed work. And there are others who put the emphasis on the large lecture courses in which suggestions and inspirations are disseminated from the best teachers and where the strongest minds will get endlessly more than from the school-like treatment of the tutors, but where the weak men may gain discouragingly little. Is it wise to put such weight on the examinations and quizzes and recitations and tests and prescribed reading by which the dullest is forced to learn something, but by which the best are held down to the level of mediocrity? Or is it wiser to stir up the self-activity, to develop that delight in learning and thinking which may lead the superior men to lasting achievements? It is easy to ridicule the ineffectiveness of the mere lectures for the lower men of the classes, but easier still to show up the cheapness of the recitation and quiz system for the better men.

This must not be confused, as it sometimes is in the discussions, with the antithesis of aristocratic and democratic views. The educational aristocrats would say that anyhow the best men alone count, just as the achievements of a nation in the history of civilization are counted by the performances of the geniuses. They would say that a little land like Norway is great because it has had an Ibsen and a Grieg and a Bjornson, and so on, and a large land like Canada has still to wait for greatness because no genius has yet appeared there. But the educational democrat who sees the goal in the highest development of the masses would misunderstand the sociological laws if he were to care less for the greatest possible chances of the superior men. The masses, too, are always raised only by their leaders. Universities which work for the greatest possible opportunities for the best men are more efficiently working toward the raising of the average level than those which hamper the strong and pamper the weakling. Truly it is discouraging to see how those thousands of students spend years in an atmosphere of learning and yet open a book in the library only with the question as to which chapters are prescribed for their reading and feel an instinctive horror of the unprescribed pages. Then we wonder that the result of our methods is an intellectual apathy and that the graduates in their clubs, when they return in later life,

fall into raptures of enthusiasm over the football heroes and have nothing but ridicule for those who excel in scholarship in their college days. They feel as if they were doing a great deed if perhaps at the distribution of awards for the best scholars they pump up a speech which not entirely but almost excuses the existence of a scholar.

Here again we may say that the same principles less clearly defined are in opposition in the school career. Much of the zigzag course of our school reforms results from the wavering between a desire to awake the superior pupils to fullest spontaneity and the counter-desire to adjust everything to the average and sub-average. There can be hardly any doubt that the nation wastes an immense wealth of natural gifts by destroying in tender years the instinctive desire for learning and the joy in intellectual pursuits. The original curiosity of the pupils who want to find out more than that which is handed out to them is the clearest prediction of later high attainments in the world of culture. But it can be quickly subdued if it finds no encouragement. And all this underlying wealth of the young minds will be wasted the more quickly the more the whole atmosphere of the social world is filled with an admiration for commercial success and material bigness. Our schools and colleges alike complain that they are limited in their cultural efficiency by the super-

ficiality and materialism of the social surroundings. They are too little aware that they, and perhaps they alone, have the means to remold the community and to give higher standards for the future.

The question, what kind of students ought to receive the foremost consideration is connected most intimately with the fundamental question as to what kind of teachers we need. Here again the university shows the issues most clearly. The friends of the college seem fundamentally divided in their opinions. One party puts all the emphasis on the effectiveness and ability of the teacher as such. His pedagogic skill, his indefatigable perseverance in explaining and drilling, his ability to make the material interesting, seem the most important qualifications. The other party believes in the productive scholar. His ability to add to human knowledge by his own research and by his own mastery of scientific method qualifies him more than anything else for the rôle as leader of the best students. The mere reproductive teacher who hands over what others have found and thought can never stimulate the noblest attitude toward the world of thought, that of interest and spontaneity. Here, too, it is easy to exaggerate the possible defects. It is, indeed, possible that a man who makes decisive contributions to the world of knowledge may be a first-class scholar and yet may be entirely unable to impart this knowledge to any group of students. It

is the duty of the nation to create for such men research positions in which their genius may follow its desires. But they are the exceptions. On the whole, the man who is the master of productive method is probably a fair teacher too. In the large universities accordingly, the victorious tendency at last seems to be the preference for the productive mind. A tradition is slowly being formed which essentially indicates that the best places belong to those who have contributed most to the advancement of knowledge. Indeed, there should be no doubt that it lies in the deepest interest of the true university that when the good teacher and the good scholar stand in competition, the good scholar ought to be selected every time. The influence of his spirit will be felt and will be far deeper with those men who are to be the leaders of the next generation in every field of life.

Yet the country recognizes with increasing clearness that this most desirable type of teachers for the academic youth cannot be found in sufficient number and that an incessant effort is needed if the nation is to create that type of productive teachers. There seems to be a widespread disappointment. Hundreds of young men take the doctor degrees, prepare for the highest class of productive scholarship and after a few years their ambition seems to have evaporated and their entire work has become nothing but routine teach-

ing. This is perhaps the most important educational problem before the country, while on the surface it appears as if it were a secondary question, almost a question concerning a byproduct. No; the right kind of university teacher makes the university, he and he alone, and the right university creates the right standards of intellectual life throughout the nation, and the right national standards produce the right type of schools for the masses.

It cannot be denied that many factors of our national life work strongly against this stimulation to creative scholarship. One thing stands in the foreground. The career of the scholar has not that social attractiveness, not that instinctive recognition in the community which would draw the strongest talents into its service; and no technique can make a first-class scholar from second-rate material. Here is not the place to discuss the conditions which may increase the value of the scholarly productiveness. But we ought to admit without hesitation: this most ideal value will not be secured in our social fabric without material support. In a country in which success is too often measured by money and popular fame, the career must make concessions to these national conditions. Popular fame for the scholar cannot be made to order. As long as the country has no instinctive respect for the great scholar and does not care for his solid achievements, it cannot

be promised to the young man who wants to decide whether his energy and talent should be turned to scholarship or to law or banking. This strongest incentive will not come until the nation has reached a much higher level of productive scholarship. To rely entirely on the internal motives, the joy of production and the life of intellectual progress, is to underrate the strength of the counter temptations. The only direct appeal must therefore be phrased in the language which is spoken all around; it must take the character of financial promise.

First of all, the career of the university teacher ought to be one of financial security. Hence we cannot value too highly those steps which have been taken in recent years toward a pension system for university teachers. Above all, the Carnegie Foundation has added much to the security of the scholarly life. Yet even that is a help only if it is taken in the right spirit. The promise of a pension ought to give to the teacher the feeling that if disease makes him unable to live up to his ideal profession he will be protected against need, and such a pension ought to come to him even if the years of service were few. But it is well known that the Carnegie Foundation started with the promise that any professor after twenty-five years of service would have the right to a pension without reference to his physical or mental disability. The

originators of this plan had the vague hope that this might give to some scholars the opportunity to devote themselves entirely to research work in which they had been hampered by their teaching engagements. These hopes had little basis. The man who in twenty-five years of teaching does not find the energy for research will not begin when his teaching stops. It would be an amateurish tampering with science. But too many men in the land interpreted the offer in a quite different spirit. They saw in it a welcome chance to get rid of the burden of teaching. Instead of adding dignity to the work, the offer threatened to lower the appreciation of the teacher's profession. Men seemed willing to throw it off as soon as possible in order to turn to more profitable engagements. It is a step forward that the Carnegie Foundation has withdrawn this offer and has made the pension dependent upon infirmity or old age.

But even now the pensioning system can be helpful only if it is not undermined by a wrong economy of the universities. There is a lurking danger that the universities will offer to the young men smaller salaries on account of the promised pension. The decisive help must therefore after all come from the institutions themselves which determine the salaries of the instructors. But this seems to set narrow limits to any possible raising of the standard. The universities may

see quite clearly that the most energetic and most productive type of men would be more easily drawn into the university life if they could offer prizes similar to those which the great lawyers or captains of industry may gain. It is a sociological fact that the drawing power of a career depends upon the very highest rewards and not upon the average. The universities may know that, but they know still better that their budget generally ends with a deficit and that the trustees have to go begging. How can they quadruple the salaries of their professors, when they have the greatest difficulty to make both ends meet with the meager salaries of to-day?

But may there not be a grave mistake responsible for such a discouraging outlook? Would not these means even to-day be ample if only a deep-rooted prejudice were eradicated? The universities all over the country believe that they gain strength by increasing the number of the staff instead of putting all the emphasis on the quality. All our higher institutions of learning are overmanned and however much they try to enlarge the staff and to create new and ever new positions, the day will come when they will recognize that less would be more and that they would be greater with fewer men. A university is not a department store; it needs the chiefs of divisions but not an army of salesmen and floorwalkers. If the great universities were

slowly to reduce their faculty to a third and add the salaries of the other two-thirds to the income of the men who remain, or rather, if for the remaining third of the places men were found who deserved that three-fold salary, a great service to national education would be done. Of course, such a strongly reduced staff could not possibly do all the intellectual police service which is to-day expected from the crowd of teachers. The professors would be intellectual leaders who show the way but would leave it to the interest of the students whether they would be ready to follow. The situation would become more like that of the German universities in which ten men often cover the ground for which fifty seem indispensable here and yet secure more real stimulation to highest work. There is not the slightest need for practically every course to be offered every year and for everything worth studying to be presented in lecture form. The printing-press was invented quite a while ago; the university lecture is not destined to present the whole subject but to give stimulus for spontaneous study. Of course, then, the catalogues of the rival universities would not be heavy volumes.

It is evident that this problem cannot be translated directly into the language of school questions. The schoolteacher ought not to be a productive scholar, and yet the essential decision ought to be the same — namely, that the personal quality of the teacher, his

highminded attitude toward the world of thought, is more important than anything in the school work and that no effort ought to be spared by the community to secure the best possible human material. The schools cannot fulfill their mission if the teaching positions are simply filled by the lowest bidders. The crowding out of men from the teacher's calling and the rushing in of women who teach simply because they want to escape the drudgery of domestic work is unworthy of a nation whose material resources are unparalleled. The social standing of the schoolteacher must be raised in the community, his income increased, his pension secured, his working time not overcrowded, his scholarly interest kept alive. A cheap schoolteacher ultimately means a cheap nation.

We have spoken of the choice of studies, of the kind of pupils and of the kind of teachers. We have not spoken yet of the kind of scholarly methods which ought to prevail. There is no doubt that here, too, antagonistic movements can be felt. We may understand the varieties of attitudes most quickly if we give to them a national background. The prevailing method of university work to-day is distinctly the German method. While the old college was thoroughly English, the dome of the university which overspans it to-day is built from German stone. Through half a century the best young scholars went over the ocean to

bring home from the German universities that spirit of painstaking research which has secured a unique place for German scholarship. The German doctor's degree was introduced where before only the bachelor's and master's degrees were known and the organization of the highest institutions was consciously planned under German influence. Now a manifold opposition can be felt. There is a western group, especially at home in the state universities, which claims that German science is too abstract and theoretical, too far from practical interests and that in a democracy the only scholarship with a right to exist is that which serves the practical needs of the masses. Yet this opposition cannot hope for success. A glance at the history of civilization shows that true progress toward practical goals has always been reached by science only when the scientific work was done for its own sake without any reference to the practical application. All the great revolutionizing applications of knowledge have been only the ripe fruits from the tree of theory.

But there are others who do not claim that German science is useless but who insist that it is formless. They point with preference to the polish of French scholarship, to French brilliancy and clearness. But this is an artificial prejudice created by those who see only the excrescences of German scholarship and not its core. The dissertations of the apprentices may be

formless but the works of the German leaders have been masterful in their beautiful form. Above all, the true scholar knows that in science certainly the content must never be sacrificed to the form and that truly great work can never be created unless the work is based on the thorough and careful study of the detail.

There may be still a third tendency noticed which seems to contrast with the so-called German method. Some parties miss in the technique of that new university method the liberalizing culture which was the leading trait of Oxford and Cambridge. This longing for the gentleman's scholarship after the English pattern has entered many a heart and is felt as an antithesis to those factory methods which seem inevitable in large parts of minute research. We know the beautiful plans for a graduate school of an eastern University: "Quadrangles enclosing sunny lawns, towers and gateways opening into quiet retreats, ivy-grown walls looking on sheltered gardens, vistas through avenues of arching elms, walks that wind among the groves of Academe—these are the answers in architecture and scenic setting to the immemorial longings of academic generations. . . ." These are the plans not for a school for highly specialized research but for a society of liberal and humanistic scholars where a cultured atmosphere and associations should work in an ideal way and should make the

students forget the burdens of the German method. And yet, however much we must welcome such dreams of repose in our noisy land, we cannot doubt that scholarly achievement would not lie on the path of amateurish devotion to scholarship. If we want scholarship, we must take it with all its rigorous demands, with its theoretical abstractness and with its unfailing thoroughness.

If this ideal of true scholarship is once accepted, it must have its influence on the whole intellectual life of education and schooling. This same antithesis of pure science and practical science plays its part in the discussion of our school men in a hundred forms. On the one side we see the insistent efforts to make the school lesson more and more practical, to connect everything with the daily occurrences, to transform the work into practical observation; and on the other side the effort to develop theory and logical thought in the growing pupils. May there not be more right on this latter side than the fashion of our day believes? Is there not indeed a danger that these new and ever new optical impressions flit through the mind without a lasting value and that this handling of a hundred practical things become play without learning? Even the slightest experiment, in order to be of real service to the mind, must be understood as a demonstration of a principle; that is to say, the theory must be underlying every demonstration. We appeal by far too much to

the senses and while in this way we may make it easy for the boy and girl, and for the teacher too, we miss the real aim of intellectual development.

Still more does it seem important for the school to take to heart that demand for thoroughness as against mere amateurishness and impressionism. Of course the thoroughness of the schoolboy cannot be that of the scholar. But the principle remains the same. Wherever the field of learning is entered, there must be a rigid demand that everything be done as well as it can be done. There is enough spirit of dash in the nation. What our public life and our private life demand is an additional spirit of thoroughness, and the contact with the world of knowledge is the great opportunity to acquire it, if knowledge is approached in the right attitude. It is better to learn one thing thoroughly than a dozen things superficially. The dangerous belief that everybody can do everything and the disrespect for the wisdom of the expert will then slowly fade away. The carelessness of our school instruction to-day is often scandalous. The slapdash methods of spelling and mental arithmetic with which our boys and girls go from the grammar school into life are typical of the pedagogical calamity.

Unnumbered other questions rush forward. Everywhere we see opposing tendencies, outspoken or silent. Many of our university discussions are controlled by a

seeking for the right form of organization; the underlying antithesis is self-government of the teaching body versus authority. Hardly any other problem of university life has provoked so much epigrammatic writing and so much practical experimenting in recent years. The misuses which flourish in certain places through the present traditional system can hardly be denied and while the character of the university presidency has changed greatly in the last half century, it seems an anomaly that the large universities are conducted with a framework of administration which was originally constructed for the small colleges. The trustees who appoint professors with the feeling that they may do with them as with any hired clerks are probably dying out everywhere, but the more the professionally uninformed trustees are obliged to lean on the president, the more an authority becomes centered in him which can be tolerable to the faculty members only if it is exerted with wisdom and sincere respect for the work of the scholar. In places where the president's leading aim seems to be bigness and external growth and personal policy, the rumbling dissatisfaction can well be understood, the more as with such autocratic tendencies of the presidential boss, the moral energy and self-reliance of the faculty members is quickly undermined. The large university is then managed like a big commercial company and every outer gain means to

the nation a loss of internal values. Compromise plans have sprung up and have been tried repeatedly in recent years, and the present tendency indeed seems to be to give to the professors a certain official share in the appointment of new colleagues. Yet this too is certainly a question which has its two sides. There are not a few who feel that the prevailing harmony and unity of our best university faculties may severely suffer, as soon as not problems of work but struggles about men become prominent in their discussions. Already the specialists everywhere are probably advisers of the administrative authorities, when the appointment of fellow specialists is in question. But the situation is very different if the advisers have to make final decisions and if whole faculties are drawn into the wrangle about various candidates. The dangers of a senatorial courtesy, of logrolling and nepotism, of breaking up into factions and the development of boss rule among scholars, of whom the least valuable ones would become the most skillful academic politicians are always imminent. If it is claimed against the present system that externalities are pushed into the foreground of the academic consciousness and the essentials too often forgotten, it may be more than doubtful whether any gain could be hoped for from pushing the scholars themselves into the administrative whirl. The standing argument of the friends of reform is the

case of the German universities. It has often been pointed out that in the German monarchy the universities are thoroughly republican in their organization, a self-governing body of scholars, while in republican America the universities are monarchical, the instructors being without official influence on the promotions and appointments. Yet while there is a germ of truth in this, it is an exaggeration. The rule of the German universities is that in the case of a vacancy, the professors have to select three men as candidates for the place, and the government authorities, which correspond to the president and the trustees of the American universities, have to select one of the three. But firstly it cannot be denied that all those disadvantages of personal factionism, group forming for mutual help in semipolitical academic struggles, with all kinds of nepotism and prejudicial treatment, have set in through this right of the faculties and no longer disturb the university world simply because they are sanctioned by long tradition over there. But still more essential is another point. The government authorities are not really bound to respect those three propositions of the universities and the greatest periods of Prussian universities have been just those times in which the government had the courage not infrequently to disregard those wishes of the faculty. And where they preferred to yield, their administrative relation always gives them abundant

chance to exert pressure on a majority of the faculty to bring the name of the desired candidate into the official list. But certainly the demand for changes of some kind in the American system seems to grow steadily and in recent days it has not seldom been felt that a still greater danger than that of arbitrary appointments lies in the possibility of reckless changes in scholarly policy without any consultations with the true experts. All this repeats itself on a miniature scale in the schools. The inferiority of the school boards in many a place is primarily a political question and not an educational one. But the relation of the teachers to the superintendents and school boards is decidedly an educational problem and here too everything depends upon the equilibrium of the administrative and the teaching forces.

We see practically the same antithesis in the relation between pupils and teachers, the demand for self-government on the one side, for authority and discipline on the other. On the college level, as in the school, tendencies to strengthen the personal responsibility of the pupils alternate with tendencies to reënforce the power of authority. And all these struggling impulses may interfere with one another or help one another. Is it surprising that the total impression is one of educational nervousness and unrest?

THE CASE OF THE REPORTER

This essay first appeared in McClure's Magazine

THE CASE OF THE REPORTER

THE glory of our land has always been that its highest power is public opinion. Public opinion has made war and peace, has made laws and institutions, has shaped the whole national civilization. It is therefore the chief endeavor of the nation to bring everybody into contact with the sources of information, in order that public opinion may be well instructed. Progress in this direction has been wonderful. The amount of reading of newspapers which discuss public affairs surpasses that in any other country. The social reformer, however, can hardly overlook the other aspect; do those papers give to the masses sufficiently correct information for a well-organized public opinion to draw from it the naked facts? Of course, we are proud to have the newspapers illuminate every corner of the national workshop and throw their searchlight into the remotest fields; but, while the papers speak about everything else, we forget that they have no reason to speak about themselves. Yet, if the country is governed by public opinion, and public opinion is largely governed by the newspapers, is it not

most essential to understand who governs the newspapers?

To be sure, everybody knows something of the economic influence of the owners and the still greater economic influence of the advertisers; everybody knows something as to the dependence of editorial writers upon national or state or municipal parties; the political and commercial influences on the papers that we read and on the coloring of their truths are on the whole no secret. The American, who likes to be independent, has tried to protect himself against such unfair side-influences by disregarding the editorials more and more and by putting the whole emphasis on the reports of the facts themselves. It seems to be the general opinion that in the last three decades the editorial page has declined in its influence and the news parts have become the essential feature. The individuality of the great editorial writers has lost its hold on the attention of the public, and the vivid, living report of actual experiences has taken a firm grasp on the popular imagination. This focuses the interest of the social student on the reporter who supplies the news. Does the American reporter fulfill his task in a spirit that is helpful to the community?

As a laboratory psychologist, I like to approach such questions, not by relying on general impressions or by developing theories that may be based on pre-

conceived ideas; I am accustomed rather to study the objects that come under my own actual observation. I am therefore obliged to refer to my own insignificant experiences with reporters, because they alone are exactly known to me. In order not to allow any mistakes of memory, I shall confine myself to rather recent experiences. I am on the whole in a favorable situation to report on such observations. If the newspapers were to drag my name or my remarks into practical politics or into commercial questions, it would be extremely difficult to demonstrate the right or wrong; any distortions might be made in the interest of a particular party or of particular persons or of particular stock quotations. But all my concerns move in entirely neutral fields. Hence I can report about my reporters with the same scientific indifference with which I should watch the subjects of my psychological experiments.

I may begin with the most harmless type. Once when I was staying in New York I had the pleasure of reading in the morning papers an interview with me dealing with the inspiring problem of why rich people like to smuggle when they pass through the custom house on their return from Europe. The interview appeared as a telegram from Boston dated the preceding night, in spite of the fact that I had been in New York a whole week. It interested me, since I

had not said a word of it, and felt sure that I should have said it a little differently if I had ever been inclined to gossip about a question that is no concern of mine. However, I remembered that, while I was in the midst of work in my Harvard laboratory some time before, a young man had come to ask me what I thought, from a psychological point of view, about the recent reports of smuggling. I told him — what I have said a hundred times to reporters — that I am not in the habit of giving interviews, and that I was not in the least interested in the question. Then he asked me whether I did not believe that the psychological reason was this or that — I no longer remember what. I told him that I had no time to listen and that he might as well ask the elevator boy in his newspaper office as me. He left me, and I think nothing appeared in the Boston paper which had sent him. Nevertheless, several hundred thousand newspaper readers of New York got this interview in which his own psychological interpretation was neatly put into my mouth.

A very deep, searching interview on the problem of the psychology of shoplifting had preceded this by only a few weeks, and was reprinted from Boston to San Francisco. It brought me an abundance of correspondence from friends who agreed and enemies who disagreed, and the only pity was that I had not said a

word of all that nonsense. Of course I do not want to suggest that the so-called interviews with me never have contained anything for which I am responsible. For instance, there was a beautiful case in the Sunday edition of one of the best New York papers. The editor had sent a reporter to Boston in order to hear my views on a number of psychological and sociological questions. I told the young man that I could not give him anything. The next Sunday there appeared a long interview, filling a third of a page, embellished by my portrait, and expressing my views in a conversation that seemed thoroughly intelligent. The promising young man had simply taken some of my books and copied half pages from various places, and dramatized them by breaking in with leading questions. For instance: "Doctor, what is your view on hypnotism?" was answered by a page from my book on "Psychotherapy."

I remember one case in which I really said with my own lips what the newspaper printed. The conditions were these: A Boston newspaper sent a nice young fellow with the request that I accept a box at the first performance of a new psychologizing drama, expecting that I might say something about the play afterward. As a matter of course, I refused absolutely to think of that possibility. But, after this invitation had been delivered and rejected, the amiable messenger began in

a melodious voice to ask whether I would allow him a few words that had nothing to do with his newspaper work. He said that he had read a book of mine which had suggested to him a psychological question, and asked whether I could not, for his personal information and education, answer this question. I told him that, if he could assure me that this was in no way an interview, I had no objection to explaining what he had not understood. He sat down and talked with an intelligent face, and I answered him as I would have answered the questions of any earnest student. The next day this whole conversation, with two very witty caricatures, appeared in the newspaper, filling two columns. It ended by poking fun at the psychologist who was such a bad psychologist that he did not know when he was being interviewed, and saying that nothing was necessary to deceive him but to "speak the charmed words, 'This is not an interview.' " Of course this rascal's product also moved slowly toward the Pacific Coast.

To be sure, the case is not always so simple. Often the prettiest effects are reached when various reporters unintentionally help one another. Recently, for instance, in my psychological lecture course at Radcliffe College, I made a trivial little experiment that referred to the measurement of association times, an experiment like hundreds of others made in the same experimental

course, and probably made in a similar way by a dozen colleagues in different colleges. There was absolutely nothing new in the experiment, and nothing important, as it was merely a simple little illustration of certain psychological facts. Probably one of the young woman students talked about it, distorting and exaggerating the details, and finally it reached some of the college reporters, who made a wonderful sensational story out of it, as to how I was reading the deepest secrets in a woman's mind. This was the first act. Naturally, this important event had to be wired all over the country, and the wittiest cartoonists drew me piercing into the brains of innocent women. But the second act followed quickly. A woman reporter in New York, deeply interested in the science of psychology, went to a well-known physician and asked his opinion about this nonsense that was reported concerning my experiments. The result was that the next day the interview of the physician with the New York reporter appeared, which was also at once wired all over the land. This interview as it stood was a criminal libel, which would have been utterly unjustified and absurd, even if the criticised story had been true. As a matter of course this insulting interview was not only hopelessly distorted but as the physician wrote to me "unqualifiedly false." Yet hundreds of thousands read—and there are always readers who enjoy hearing one

scholar call another a fool — all the falsehoods connected with my name. As was to be expected, another onrush of reporters was made to my house, and while I declined any personal interview, all kinds of threatening remarks on my part were neatly served to the New York readers at their next breakfast. And these are only a few sample cases in my personal experience. It has been going on in this way for years.

My pleasant experiences have not been confined to this country, for the European papers have delightfully seconded the wit of the American sheets. Once, when I made some psychological tests on a notorious criminal behind the walls of a penitentiary, the reporters in some way gained a knowledge of it. Several papers wired that they wanted a description of my experiments from me. In accordance with my habit, I politely refused this. But as the reporters continued to whet the appetites of the readers, the papers had to bring out something. Accordingly, one of the largest New York papers asked some anonymous colleague of mine to write an essay on what a psychologist in such a case might possibly do to examine the criminal. The unknown author wrote a very fair article, in which he happened not to describe one of those methods which I had used, but gave a full account of a number of instruments which might be used by an experimentalist in the study of hidden emotions. He showed pretty illus-

trations of the sphygmograph and pneumograph for measuring the pulse and the breathing, such as appear in any physiological textbook. The New York report was wired to other places, with a slight change which made it appear that, instead of being the hypothesis of an anonymous writer, it was a fact that I had used those instruments. The next set of reporters transformed it into the statement that I had invented the instruments. At this stage the story went to London. The yellow press of England announced in big headlines that I had invented marvelous instruments by which the most secret ideas could be read. From there it spread throughout Europe in the form of an account of my "lying-machine." France especially took it up enthusiastically. Lyric poems on the subject abounded. Scores of French humorists gave variations on the theme of the lover supplied with a lying-machine, while the serious papers described with great earnestness my revolutionizing invention of instruments which for three or four decades have been household apparatus in every physiological laboratory.

Can I really be blamed, after experiences of this kind in my own humble sphere, if I cannot read any interview or report except with the underlying feeling that it is probably exaggerated, confused, or altogether invented? It has become a puzzle picture for me to seek the probable truth hidden in the confusing distor-

tions. Yet this imaginative play of my friends, the reporters, represents only one side of their gay sport. As long as they seek interviews, you can decline the honor, and at any rate you feel free from responsibility when the fake interviews appear. But they also report public affairs, speeches and discussions, and in these you cannot escape them. Here also I confine myself simply to my personal observations. The report is a hap-hazard reproduction in which the most important point is often left out, the most insignificant pushed into the foreground. Last winter I spoke at a New York banquet at which the list of official speakers contained fourteen wellknown names. The next day my speech was given in full, however much distorted, while all the other speakers were merely mentioned by name. Their speeches were much more interesting, at least to me; but I happened to speak before ten o'clock, and at ten the reporters left the hall. On another occasion I was one of three speakers. The other two speakers found their orations printed in full; my speech, which was the longest, was not even mentioned. I heard afterward that the other two had prepared their addresses in writing, while I had no manuscript. The other day I gave a Phi Beta Kappa address, and one of the papers asked me beforehand for a written synopsis of it. I had the feeling that I really had a little message, and took the trouble to prepare a serious account of my sermon.

But it was evidently not "newsy" enough, for the paper only printed the first meaningless introductory paragraph and left out the whole point. Yet the same paper had room enough in the same number to give a full account of ideas attributed to me as to the trapping of bank defaulters by psychological methods, a silly story which some crank devised.

However, as long as the reporters only omit or report carelessly, the harm is not great. But those who have gone through the high school of reporterdom have acquired a new instinct by which they see and hear only that which can create a sensation, and accordingly their report becomes not only a careless, but a hopelessly distorted one. At a public gathering recently I spoke more than half an hour, and was frequently interrupted by loud expressions of approval. At the close of the address, the president of the organization expressed to me publicly his special thanks and there was long continued applause. In the course of my discussion I had made an insignificant remark about the theory of a well-known man, expressing my disagreement. The next day in the newspapers this least important feature was presented as the real content of my address. In inch-deep headlines the local papers brought out: "Professor M. attacks Mr. X." But that was only the beginning. Those who sympathized with Mr. X and who heard nothing but that I had "attacked" him, re-

ported to their home papers the improved version that my speech had been frequently interrupted by hissing, and that at the end the public had given strong evidence of their disapproval by icy silence.

Once — President Roosevelt was still in the White House — I spoke in the Middle West at a large banquet at a gentlemen's club to which I had been invited to discuss certain features of American public life. I spoke for nearly two hours; some prominent men of the city added a few friendly remarks; and it was late at night when the leading members, in a most jovial mood, accompanied me to my hotel. We all had the feeling that the banquet had been a most successful, harmonious affair. The next morning I was still fast asleep when citizens of the East read the startling news of my abhorrent misdemeanor, and the President of the United States sat down to write a letter of indignation. My Boston friends found a full length portrait of me on the first page of their paper, with a chain around my neck on which the Declaration of Independence was hanging. When I came down to breakfast, telegrams had already poured in from the Pacific Coast. This is what had happened. At one point in my address I said that it was interesting to note that President Roosevelt had never quoted the Declaration of Independence; at another point I said that President Roosevelt once made to me a certain observation, referring

to an entirely trivial matter. The reporters had simply connected these two facts and put a little ginger into it. They had wired over the land that I said in my speech that President Roosevelt himself told me that the Declaration of Independence was ridiculous. It was this news with which even the night rest of the President was interrupted. I never in my life had to send so many telegrams in one day as I did in order to correct that mischievous report.

Of course the situation becomes still worse when newspaper men have their own little vanities or their own little vengeance. I got a noble taste of this when I went to Berlin as exchange professor. It had been my serious intention to use my German stay for the study of means by which the grotesque misrepresentation of German aims in American newspapers might be cured. I had often heard the complaint that American papers for mere convenience simply rely on the news as it is cabled from London, and that this English source gives much anti-German feeling to the reports of the day. But I soon discovered that this English coloring had a still deeper reason. I found that the majority of the American papers were served in Germany not by Americans but by Englishmen who had never set foot on American soil or by Americans whose chief function was to contribute daily to strongly anti-German London papers. I did not hide my surprise

and my criticism stirred up anger in the quarters toward which it was directed. One of the true American reporters, with whom I had no fault to find, spoke a wise word of warning to me at that time. He said: "Be careful; every newspaper man knows that his chance is coming, if he only takes the time to wait." I replied laughingly that I should be careful and should not give them a chance. Three days later the two exchange professors delivered their inaugural addresses before the university in the presence of the Emperor and the court. The next day some American papers brought out long cablegrams with the headline: "Münsterberg's Embarrassment!" The story ran that the Emperor had shown enthusiastic interest in the speech of my colleague but had snubbed me and clearly shown his disapproval. The invention was so absurd that later when the reports came back from America to Berlin, it occasioned great amusement and not least among those most immediately concerned. But the reporters had made their chance.

It would be ungrateful if I were not to acknowledge that at other times the reporters have done their very best to embellish me with glory and fame which I did not deserve. Within only a few weeks the newspapers conferred on me their great reward: my picture was printed large and small in all parts of the country, and with it went a full report of the noble fight which I

had undertaken, the fight for the man of fifty. Hundreds of thousands feel dissatisfied because when they reach the half century mark they see that younger men are preferred to them and yet they have not dared to start the battle, but now with noble courage I stood up for them. It was no wonder that letters of thanks and of congratulation poured in on me. The truth of the whole story was that a Berlin physician, Dr. Kraus, had spoken in a German paper of the unwarranted prejudice of the Americans against men of fifty. This was wired to America. A Boston reporter—I do not even know from which paper—asked me one morning over the telephone whether Dr. Kraus has a good reputation in Germany, and I answered him politely that he is an excellent man and that he is acknowledged to be a reliable physician. This conversation probably took less than two minutes, and yet hundreds of newspapers made me the hero who stands up for the man of fifty. Everything which Dr. Kraus had said was simply put into my mouth and in this form it was wired over the land. To be sure I was not long left in the position of triumphant leader, as some clever man discovered in "Who's Who" that I shall very soon be fifty myself, and then the whole story turned against me and my sly effort to make the people believe that I shall not be antiquated when I am fifty. And the jokers were not lacking who claimed that my

whole aim was to get a cheap life insurance, and comic cartoons gave their seal to it.

I might go on with these experiences page after page. Yet my purpose is not to write reminiscences. I intended only to characterize different types of reporting, and these few samples, for which I might substitute scores of others from my short American career, may be sufficient to sketch the psychological situation. I have no reason to believe that my experiences are exceptional. It is true, psychology appeals to the curiosity of the masses perhaps a little more than Sanskrit, and because I have written on many subjects, the newspapers consider me as "good copy." But on the whole, my case is probably a typical one. Most of what is reported about me is distorted. How can I expect that my fellow victims enjoy a better fate?

Is any one to blame? Certainly not the reporters. They are doing what the newspapers want. And certainly the newspapers are not to blame. They are doing what the public wants. And certainly the public is not to blame, for it does not take the matter seriously, but simply laughs about this heap of absurdities and gossip, of scandal and misinformation. And yet, is it really a tolerable situation? Where does it lead us? The newspapers themselves, and their reporters, must be constantly pushed further on this downward path. The more the public finds out that most of the news

is only half true or quarter true, the stronger must be the sensations created in order to hold the attention of the incredulous reader. The accents must become louder, the colors more glaring. The language of truth is not loud enough; it must be drowned by the noise of vulgar inventions. The immediate result is that the individual reporter must become more and more reckless; his boldness carries the day. He no longer reports events; he influences their course by turning the polite and moderate speech of a man into insulting attacks and violent statements, which naturally provoke heated replies. Instead of being the chronicler of his time, the reporter becomes, by the mere tricks of his trade, a demagogue who pushes public opinion to extremes in every matter. The public which has insisted on disregarding the editorials because it wanted to form its own opinion on the basis of facts must now see that it is faring much worse; the facts themselves become distorted in a way that makes the reader's own judgment a plaything of the reporter.

How does it work on the public? *Le roi s'amuse*; the public laughs. No one takes the trouble to correct any misstatement, no one defends himself, because everyone instinctively feels that his neighbor does not take it seriously. It is amusing to hear the gossip and to see even one's friends abused, and there can be no harm, as nobody believes any of it. But what is the

social outcome? The necessary consequence is a universal state of indifference. The public becomes indifferent to the really important issues.

And with this goes an indifference to accuracy and correctness. If the average man is constantly reading pages and pages with the feeling that the writer does not care whether it was so or not, if he finds daily that the events of to-day prove that the reports of yesterday must have been incorrect and confused, his whole mental life loses the instinct for exact distinctions. If we always moved in the illumination of late twilight, the lenses of our eyes would lose their power of accommodation to sharp outlines. There can be no doubt that lack of accuracy is one of the most serious faults of our social mind. Our entire educational system suffers from its looseness. Children leave school without ability to be careful in their spelling and mental arithmetic. Instead of thoroughness, we have only dash, and all practical life is harmed by this carelessness. Can there be anything more dangerous than this systematic education for inaccuracy by the reading of misreporting newspapers?

And finally, there must result an indifference to accusation which undermines public morality. If the reader becomes accustomed to seeing the sharpest accusations hurled against respectable persons, without anyone feeling discomfited because no one takes it seri-

ously, an ethical indifference must follow which is a most fertile soil for corruption and actual immorality. The work of the social reformer demands sincere criticism, but the important inquiries of the leading magazines have demonstrated that careful, painstaking work is necessary to make such criticism valuable and helpful. The haphazard onslaught of hasty reporters, the sensational distortions and grotesque exaggerations of everything that may serve to stir up the reader, creates an atmosphere in which just accusation becomes ineffective. It becomes almost useless for serious investigators to study seriously actual social conditions, since the people have lost the power to discriminate between serious criticism and defamatory gossip. The time has come when a reaction must set in, when the public must insist on serious, accurate, significant information, and when the newspapers must stop the reckless reporter. If a complete overturning of our newspaper methods should take place, the better part of the population would be sincerely happy at getting rid of this flimsy fabrication and cheap mass of trivial news. But the very first necessity is to recognize how badly we are served, and how that for which we are really striving is entirely taken out of our reach. A public opinion that laughingly allows itself to be constantly misinformed cannot be independent. It makes no difference whether it is misguided by a few great bosses or by

ten thousand little reporter bosses. The case of the reporter has not yet found the attention which it deserves in the fabric of our public life.

We can say this with emphasis, and yet may be quite aware what a tremendous amount of industry and energy, of knowledge and cleverness, of personal sacrifice and of personal sympathy is massed together in this work of the reporters' army. Among the American reporters I have met some of the brightest young men, and again some of the most tactful gentlemen, who would never use for publicity a personal conversation. But the alarming feature is that just these best and cleanest and finest specimens of the news-gathering profession were the ones who in hours of frank discussion complained most bitterly of the public forces which against their own will push them on the paths of exaggeration and sensationalism and train in them instincts which are sapping their finest impulses.

THE GERMANY OF TO-DAY.

This essay first appeared in the North American Review

THE GERMANY OF TO-DAY

THE American nation has become a world power and is therefore in steady contact with the countries of Europe; the newspapers abound in reports from European lands; the army of travelers who spend their summer in Europe grows from year to year; the flood of European immigrants rises alarmingly — and, in spite of all, how little the average American knows of the true Europe and how easily misunderstandings and frictions arise from such ignorance! The difference between the true picture and the caricature by the popular fancy seems in no case more astonishing than in that of Germany. The millions of German-Americans and the numberless family ties between America and the fatherland have not corrected the distorted views. Much of this prejudice against the Germans has come over from European sources; the continental cablegrams have usually gone through London, and have been retouched there by the professional spirit of anti-Germanism. Hence the Germans have too often been drawn as boisterous ruffians who were seeking to disturb the peace of the world. Some still imagine

Germany as a kind of softened Siberia with no popular government, no freedom, and no human dignity; others have heard that the Germans are dreamers, useless for the practical tasks of life; still others associate the picture of a German with a foaming mug and, possibly, the long pipe; others with military drill and maltreatment of the poor soldier: yes, even when the better informed circles are consulted, vague prejudices are brought to light. German art and literature are said to be formless and uncouth; German scholarship is accused of being narrow and dry; German social life lacks beauty and elegance; and German state life is controlled by the lasting desire to resist the movements toward peace.

Not every one of such mischievous misconceptions can be uprooted by a flying automobile trip through the Rhine Valley from Cologne to Heidelberg, or by a few weeks in Berlin at a half-American hotel. To be sure, even the hasty visitor will soon discover that the much-maligned German policemen have nowadays nothing but politeness even for the most superfluous question, and that every new-fashioned restaurant gladly serves him with mineral water instead of beer; that the parliamentary debates for politically interested readers fill a much larger space in the German newspapers than any reports from Congress in America; that even in the streets of Berlin the sight of soldiers is, on the whole,

rare; that the leading hostellries surpass in elegance anything known in Europe, and that the comfort of traveling can satisfy even the spoiled American. If the traveler happens to stay longer and really to enter into the spirit of German life and German culture, he feels more strongly from day to day how many of the differences from his native land are superficial and how many of the deeper features are common to both peoples. The whole rhythm of progress, the development of the cities with its achievements and its nuisances, the whole spirit of the land, then show him with increasing clearness the wellknown features of American life.

Yet an underlying feeling remains in his mind that there are puzzling contradictions in German life, and while he has often heard that foreigners call his own country "a land of contrasts," he gains the distinct impression that Germany is still more such a land of contrasting and contradictory tendencies. Nationalism and internationalism, hard work and esthetic enjoyment, individualism and anti-individualism, aristocracy and democracy, materialism and idealism, seem to fill all modern Germany with an inner struggle difficult to understand. Hence, even among those who are willing seriously to enter into the spirit of the land, not a few feel confused and puzzled. They cannot find out what modern Germany is aiming at. They almost regret the passing of the old Germany which could so easily be

brought to a simple formula, the schoolmaster Germany before the days of German empire and German industrialism. But all these energies, apparently so contradictory, may ultimately make up a well-organized and unified national character. These seeming contradictions may fundamentally be two aspects of a deeper unity, and he who examines earnestly these great contrasting forces in German life must finally discover that, in different forms and under somewhat different cultural conditions, after all, the same energies are shaping modern America too.

To begin at the beginning, the modern German is thoroughly nationalistic. This has not always been so, and to those who know Germany only through its classical literature and its cosmopolitan atmosphere, the change often seems striking. Its newness, of course, sometimes leads to exaggeration, but it would be utterly wrong to speak of German chauvinism. It has rightly been said that chauvinism is, anyhow, nothing but the patriotism of other peoples; though, indeed, a type of patriotism does exist which is intolerant and which lacks internal respect and earnest acknowledgment of the value of other countries. Nothing is further from the German attitude. Certainly the modern German is proud of his fatherland and its achievements, of its industry and of its army, of its scholarship and of its music, but he is supremely interested in all that other

nations do; and if perhaps he sometimes claims that his thoroughness of work is unsurpassed in the world or that his sentiment comes from deeper sources, he is certainly no less aware of how much he lacks some tendencies and faculties which he admires in others.

The German nationalism is the loyal belief in the mission of the German spirit in the world. As such it is, indeed, a vehement protest against the cosmopolitanism which Germany's poets and thinkers upheld at a time of political weakness. When Germany's political power was paralyzed, the thoughts of the best men played with a philosophic humanism which was to stand above political citizenship. In their speculative dreams man as a rational being seemed hampered and subdued by the narrowness of ties of the state and of national conditions of life. The ideal seemed to be to forget the provincialism of all which separates man from man and to enter with the whole heart into the citizenship of the world.

This colorless and characterless cosmopolitanism has been swept away by the enthusiasm for the German Empire. It did not yield at once to the historic attitude which is the controlling force to-day. The first decades of the new Germany were deeply influenced by the immense progress of naturalistic sciences. The biological question of racial descent and racial conflicts stood in the foreground and disturbed more than it ac-

centuated the joy in the German unity, as Germany, like every other nation, is a mixture of many different racial elements. But the new century has brought a decided reaction against this naturalistic influence. The idea of the nation as a state has carried the day. Not a German race is to be perpetuated; but a nation of men who are filled with German ideals and who believe in the German task, is to be strengthened and served by the patriot. This new emotional attitude brings a new life to everything in which German historical tradition is living and a new joy in every advance which shows a characteristically German stamp. It has given strength to the German political striving, and, although far from any imperialistic vaingloriousness, it demands a strong army and navy.

The apparent contrast to all this lies in the strong international interest which can be felt throughout Germany. It is no longer that old, often ridiculed desire of the Germans to imitate the foreigner and to over-estimate everything which comes from without the boundaries of the land. That was the most unpleasant byproduct of the cosmopolitan Germany which has disappeared. The German language itself is witness of the effort to uphold pure German against the influx of foreign idioms. It is too little noticed what a change has come to the German style within the last twenty years, and how the words of foreign origin

are instinctively replaced by words of German root. Yet the German has not lost his decided talent for entering into the spirit of foreign nations. He easily learns the foreign languages, feels at home in foreign literatures, and when he travels adjusts himself without effort—often by far too easily—to the nations he visits. Throughout history the Germans have for this reason often played the rôle of natural mediators. Through their influence the various nations have come into contact; and this spirit of internationalism is as vivid to-day as it ever was. At Berlin University are two thousand foreign students; in the German playhouses the dramatic literature of the world finds a genuine appreciation; German scholarship seeks the closest contact with the research of all nations; German commerce is helped by nothing more than by the readiness of the Germans to settle for a while in foreign lands, and just the newest Germany furnishes more globetrotters than any other country.

All this finds its background in a most serious love for international peace on the part of the German nation. The outsiders forget that Germany has now had unbroken peace for over forty years, and that the Emperor who was denounced as a warlord has been on the throne for twenty-five years without drawing the sword. Certainly the German nation loves its army and considers the years of military service as a

fine schooling for manhood and as a splendid training in that discipline which gives backbone to the whole public life. Above all, living in the center of Europe, east and west tightly pressed by excitable neighbors, it knows that a strong army is the only safe insurance against national dangers and destruction. But the same German populace which is proud of its army has the strongest desire that there be no need of its being led to the battlefield. To be sure, German patriotism still mourns at the thought that the globe was divided among the great nations before Germany came to unity and strength, and that as a result Germany's colonies are unimportant compared with those of some other leading nations. Nor will Germany ever forget the warning of the favorite poet of the masses, the outcry of Schiller, that infamous is the nation which does not sacrifice everything for its honor. But the Germans of to-day know how easily any trivial quarrel can be made to appear an issue of honor to the hysterical element of a nation. They see clearly that the most fortunate war would be a disturbance of Germany's steady, sound development, while an unfortunate war would ruin everything. It is true that there is less heard in Germany than in America about the systematic agitation for peace. The peace societies have no considerable influence in German public life, there are no powerful promoters, and no Carnegie helps their cause. But

this certainly does not indicate a weaker love for peace; it indicates an instinctive feeling that in the complicated situation of European rivalries mere declamations about disarmament cannot help the cause of peace in the least. There is even a widespread sentiment that the direct discussion of peace has its elements of danger. Peace is something negative; it means the absence of fighting and war, and all the pacificatory debates drag the idea of war and fighting constantly into the midst of the popular imagination. Such ideas, which so easily appeal to the lower instincts of man and to his most excitable layers of emotions, may become causes for the excitements which they aim to suppress. The conditions, however, which really work toward the conservation of European peace become more stable and firm in Germany from year to year. The strong new nationalism and patriotism with all its pride in the German army and its contempt for a weak cosmopolitanism is not at all in contrast but ultimately in deepest harmony with this peace-loving internationalism which acknowledges and respects the characteristics of every other nation. Is this doubleness of mind really strange to the American social consciousness? Is not the American mind also deeply filled with the patriotism which believes in battleships and at the same time with the sincere, deep-rooted love for peace?

The most striking change, however, which has come

to the new Germany is the unprecedented development of its material life, which seems in direct contrast with Germany's claim for preëminence in idealistic endeavors. If a German had left Berlin at the beginning of the eighties and returned to-day without having seen the capital in the meantime, he would hardly recognize the modest city of the time of the old emperor. Berlin has become rich and luxurious, and every city of the empire and almost every small town repeats this impression given by the metropolis. It has been the change from agrarian Germany to industrial Germany. In the beginning of the eighties more than two hundred thousand Germans went to America as emigrants every year, as the German soil was not rich enough to support them. Since that time the population has grown rapidly, and yet the emigration has gone down to a tenth part of that earlier figure because the industrialized life gives to the sixty-three millions a comfortable support; there are no slums in any German city. The change is a fundamental one, and this means that it has revolutionized not only the street life and the shop-windows, the hotels and the private homes, the places of amusement and the comfort of traveling, but that it has changed the inner attitude of the German mind. That Germany which seems old-fashioned to the younger generation considered the economic life and all which had to do with business and trade and com-

merce and industry as something of second rank, more or less as a necessary evil. The strongest, best elements of the social organization, the intelligent boys of well-to-do families became officers and lawyers, scholars and physicians, government employés and land-owners, but they looked down on the calling of the business man and on all technical activities. To-day in exactly these social groups the callings of the lawyer and of the officer have somewhat lost in attractiveness, and the lifework of the banker, of the business man, and of the manufacturer, and above all the technical professions have risen rapidly in the general estimation. It is clear that this involves a circle: the prosperity of the land draws the best elements into wealth-producing activities, and it is just this support by the best and strongest minds which works most directly toward the increase of Germany's prosperity. Moreover, it is characteristic of this new commercial period that the long inhibited spirit of enterprise comes to its own. In England and in France the population saves its wealth, and the national capital therefore gives a relatively small interest. In Germany, as in the United States, the new income is at once put into new undertakings with all their risks, and hence in both lands the population gains the highest dividends. The representatives of industry and commerce have gained a social importance in new Germany which the preceding generation would not have under-

stood. The rapid spread of sport and sport interests, which presupposes abundant means, has become one of the most effective vehicles of the social changes. Even the modest householder who in previous times hardly thought of a little vacation now knows that the whole family must go to a summer resort for long weeks, and he who is better off and who in earlier times traveled to the Rhine must now visit Norway and Egypt and take a trip to St. Moritz or the Riviera in the middle of the winter.

Such a change is not to everybody's liking. Many do not want to forget the life of the time when Germany was poor but when its philosophy and literature were flourishing and the world looked on the Germans as dreamers and thinkers. They liked the queer streets of Weimar better than the avenues of Berlin West. But it would be utterly wrong to claim that Germany in the garments of wealth has become disloyal to its historic tradition. Does not the art of the Renaissance show the beauty and splendor of the German life of the past? The Thirty Years War of the seventeenth century destroyed the prosperity of the land and for two centuries threw the fatherland into a state of poverty in which economy became the most necessary virtue, and a one-sided overestimation of the spiritual became the natural comfort in the physical distress. The days of the German Hansa were days of commercial pride.

Now these old jubilant feelings of prosperity begin to revive again. But, just as in the glorious times of the Renaissance the life in wealth was most harmoniously connected with the life in beauty and with the highest appreciation of scholarship and art and literature, this new turn to commercial strength again seeks its expression in idealistic endeavors. It is not true, as the critics hastily claim, that this new comfort brings with it the vices of the parvenu, sensual materialism, and lack of higher standards; it is not true that Germany becomes unfaithful to its great traditions in the ideal realms, because it has ceased to be the poor underpaid and underfed schoolmaster of the world. On the contrary, the greater means of the land allow an expansion of the joy in art and music and drama such as has not been known before. The institutions for scholarship and research are multiplying on an unprecedented scale, and the alarmingly increasing number of new books which appear yearly in Germany indicates surely that the new-fashioned sports have not driven out the old-fashioned German sport of writing. He who looks to the deeper processes in the national life even discovers the beginning of a great idealistic movement in the younger generation. In philosophy and literature, in politics and art and religion, the mere naturalism and realism seem to be losing ground and to be yielding to a new romanticism. In the universities the philosophical lecture-rooms

which were for a long time neglected again attract the scholars of to-morrow. There has come a kind of reaction against the mere collecting of facts and gathering of scientific data. A longing for wide perspectives and for unified views of the world begins a new reign. The eccentricities of the realistic drama have given place to exquisite poetry; the naturalistic stage-setting which was the pride of twenty years ago has been replaced by symbolistic stage effects which speak to the imagination through color and suggestion. The whole field of social problems has become the working-ground for a genuine, enthusiastic, ethical idealism entirely unknown to the older time which had not discovered its social responsibilities.

On the surface, to be sure, it looks more as if pleasure-seeking were the central aim. The stranger who comes to a German city is amused and sometimes even morally shocked by the abundance of dining-places and restaurants, cafés and beer gardens, which seem crowded from the morning hours to the early hours of the next morning. These German people seem to have nothing to do, they do not keep meal hours, but seem to dally away their days in light talk and light beverages. The same gayety fills the amusement places of a thousand types, the variety shows and the sport palaces, the circuses and the dancing halls. This artificial pleasure-seeking of the city dwellers is even outdone by the natu-

real enjoyments of the people in every town and every hamlet. Whatever the source of their merriment may be, they seem to live in joy and in fun, taking life easily. Yes: there is no nation which has learned so well the one lesson which America has not yet learned, to gain true satisfaction from pleasure.

It is this life-enjoying side of the nation's character which has given to love and to the play of love such a surprisingly large place in the national culture. This is repeated on every level. The coarse and vulgar imitation of love has found an expansion which makes the night life of Berlin almost unique in the world. The Americans who formerly flocked to Paris as the gayest city have known for some years that the voluptuous turmoil of the Friedrichstrasse outshines all the capitals of Europe to-day. But every salon, every festival, shows the same playful indulgence in the game of the senses. No doubt much of the spirit of the rococo time has arisen again with all its tender fancies, with its silken waistcoats, and its hand-kissing cult, and with all its hidden symbols of erotic emotion. The visitor who strolls through the streets and looks over the display in the windows of the numberless bookstores is surprised at the abundance of books on sexual questions. It seems as if all Germany had nothing else in mind but love-making and love-giving and love-abusing; and this means that it appears like a country of leisure.

Even in the sphere of highest cultural interests this remoteness from the cares of the busy day is everywhere apparent. There is no greater contrast than labor and art. Labor aims to change this world of brutal facts, and connects every effort with practical needs. Art seeks to make man forget the demands of practical life and sink with his whole heart into a beautiful appearance which is separated and cut off from the events of surrounding reality. The German evidently lives in this unreal world and wants to be enmeshed in the artistic creation. Berlin alone heard last winter fourteen hundred formal concerts, and to the Germans the ever-new efforts of the dramatic stage do not mean simply entertainments to fill an empty evening, but the most important affairs of life. The beautiful illusion which does not allow any intruding work appears more essential than the practical setting of a laborious existence. In Germany not girls alone read lyrics and visit the painting exhibitions. Esthetic enjoyment seems the deepest life-element of the happy nation. Is such a nation really able to do hard work and to fight its battles of industry?

Yet the expert who travels through Germany, who visits her workshops and her mills, her seaports and her commercial centers, her mines and her farms, is never in danger of being troubled by such a doubt. At every turn of his road he feels with certainty that this is a

nation at work, an army of laborers. The story of Germany's assiduous efforts in the fields of education and science, of art and thought, has always been familiar to the world. But the outsiders know too little of the dogged earnestness with which the producers of wealth have gone to work and carried out their task. The American is too easily inclined to measure this economic achievement only by its final outcome as compared, perhaps, with the production of the United States. But if the value of the personal factor is correctly to be estimated, it is most important to recognize the fundamental difference in the economic setting of the two peoples. The Americans live in a gigantic country thinly settled in most parts and with treasures of nature which until recently appeared inexhaustible. The Germans live in a small land with little elbow room for the population and on a poor soil with scanty gifts of nature. In America there are less than nine inhabitants to the square kilometer of ground, in Germany about one hundred and fifteen to the square kilometer. When the German Empire was founded in 1871, 540,777 square kilometers were occupied by a population which amounted to seventy-five inhabitants to the square kilometer, less than forty-one million people. There had been a steady increase in the German nation before the foundation of the empire; in 1851 there were only thirty-six millions on the same

ground. But with the new political strength the increase became more rapid. The year 1900 brought it to fifty-six million, the year 1910 to sixty-five million.

The grain products of the fields at the time when the German Empire arose were sufficient to feed those forty million, and there still remained some grain for export. Five million more hungry people could not find their bread on German soil. Yet the sixty-five million of to-day live incomparably better than the forty million of forty years ago. The whole standard of living has been raised on every social level. The modest comfort of the laboring population and the luxury of the rich both surpass the dreams of the foregoing generation; and yet no precious metals have been discovered in the German mines, no cotton could be raised in its fields, no coal and iron beyond the internal needs of the nation have been found. All this change has come through German energy, and without fear the German nation looks forward to the days when eighty or a hundred million will live within the narrow boundaries on its ungrateful soil. It is true that Germany has to import much of its food and has to bring from far distances its cotton and silk and much of its iron and copper, of its wool and its oil, of its wood and its fur, of its coffee and its tobacco. But it has ample means to pay with the products of labor by mind and body, as the agrarian State has changed into an industrial coun-

try which may import much raw material, but which can export the finished products of organized activity. During the year 1910 Germany's total foreign commerce amounted to 17,614 million marks, while that of the United States, expressed in marks, was only 13,871 million, that of France 10,212 million, Russia 5,047 million, and only Great Britain over-towered by the figure of 24,741 million. The increase has been steady; in 1905 Germany's foreign commerce amounted to 13,507 million marks, in 1910 to 11,088 million. Every statistical record shows how the new Germany has succeeded in a fight against tremendous odds. It has become rich in spite of a growth of population which no longer allowed it to feed itself with the product of its own fields, in spite of meager natural resources, and in spite of a geographical political situation which has forced the nation to carry gigantic burdens for military and naval preparations for the hour of danger. What are the forces in the make-up of the modern Germany which have secured this surprising success?

The student of social psychology cannot overlook the fact that very different tendencies have coöperated toward it, tendencies which seem to a certain degree contradictory and which indeed belong to very different sides of the German personality; tendencies, moreover, some of which are shared with the American economic

worker and some of which are thoroughly un-American. For instance, the German shares with his American rival the spirit of enterprise which has contributed so much to the often feverish industrialization and which has drawn the German business man out into the world and has built up the German foreign trade. But at the same time the German believes in and loves an economy which does not allow the least waste and which tries to make use of the smallest byproducts, a trait which appears to the typical American as contrary to the spirit of enterprise. The American would feel that such consideration of the small meant smallness, and that such petty carefulness would paralyze the great undertakings. In the German temperament economy and enterprise are intertwined. Yet they are of quite different origin in the nature of the German people. The economic tendency has resulted from a protracted period of suffering. The misery which the Civil War brought to the Southern States was insignificant compared with the devastation which the Thirty Years War in the seventeenth century inflicted on Germany; while the new South began to prosper after a few decades, nearly two centuries were necessary to bring back the flourishing conditions of the past in Germany.

In those periods in which Germany had raised itself to unprecedented heights in literature and philos-

ophy, the people had to school themselves in economic modesty and carefulness. The Germans of the sixteenth century had been lavish, especially in the commercial centers, but the long training in national poverty entirely eradicated that trait; and, while in the last two decades with the new wealth a new education for economic splendor has set in, the people as a whole still remain fundamentally frugal and, above all, abhorrent of all waste. In this respect the development has been exactly the opposite in American experience. In a land with unlimited treasures the people fancied that it was the greatest economy of energy to waste the gifts of nature, until only recently the national conscience awoke. This painstaking German economy has contributed enormously to the success in the material struggle of the young empire. Whoever compares the German methods of building dams across the valleys in order to save every fertilizing drop of water with American extravagance must be deeply impressed with the beneficial result of this hard training of the German nation. But the same disposition shows its effects in every simple business concern and in every humble household. It is an old experience that in the German kitchen nourishing and appetizing courses are prepared from material which the American housewife would throw away; and the impulse of the German woman would resist the capricious demands of the American

fashion which discards almost new garments because they are slightly out of style. The spirit of enterprise, on the other hand, is the inherited gift of the Teutonic peoples. It was for a long while subdued by the narrowness of the external conditions, but it has come to its own again with the joy in the new empire; and the same longing which made the Germans eager to cross the frontiers and the oceans has stirred them to pioneer work in every field of human activity.

But economy and enterprise would not have secured the actual results if the German had not an inborn delight in industrious activity. He loves his amusements in his leisure hours and can be happy with most naïve pleasures. But he knows that work is work and that it should be done with the best efforts of the whole personality. This instinct is not a matter of chance; it is a product of systematic education. It is a favorite and natural dogma of democracy that man as far as possible ought to be free and that discipline ought, therefore, to be reduced. This, no doubt, has its advantageous sides for the development of the future citizen whose spirit of independence will be stimulated early through an education which gladly eliminates everything, that does not suit the taste and liking. But it also has its grave dangers. It brings superficiality into the human life; and America is beginning to discover that a youth who never has learned to be obedient will not be obedi-

ent to his own demands. America substitutes for this early educational discipline at first sport with its rigid demands, and later an overvaluation of money, which stimulates the working energies to their maximum. In Germany a systematic education with sharp training and hard discipline early inculcates into every mind a habit of hard work. This energy for doing one's duty in spite of all selfish temptations is, moreover, greatly strengthened by the years of military service, the great national high school of labor and disciplined effort. Just as the social and hygienic value of a free Sunday can be considered without any reference to religion, the economic value of the obligatory military service can be considered without any reference to peace and war. As a training time for energetic regulated activity the German army life is of unsurpassed value to the nation.

One other feature which has contributed not the smallest part to the success of German economic life is the product of school training, too — namely, the belief in expert knowledge. American development for a long while pointed in another direction. The democratic conviction is always at first that everybody is fit for every position and that an energetic, clever fellow can handle any proposition which the day may bring. The political structure of the land made it necessary that the cabinet ministers and the ambassadors, every rural postmaster and every custom-house officer, and in

municipal service every mayor and every department chief, be found among men who never had had any training in the particular line of work. This political principle has strongly affected the instinctive attitude of the people in every sphere. Commercial and industrial life in America show the traces of this sentiment everywhere. In no other country do men go so often and so easily from one life activity to another, or step into business with so little specialized preparation. Only the last period of American civilization indicates a change. The growing complexity and the fierceness of the rivalry have slowly convinced the nation that even the most brilliant dash cannot always be substituted for the thoroughness of specialized training. From year to year the expert has more and more come to his own in American life. In Germany exactly the opposite principle was the starting-point. The entire political organization demanded firm and fixed careers controlled by examinations for the governmental service on every level.

This belief, deeply ingrained in the German mind, has shaped the whole German commercial world too. A man sticks to his specialty, and no one but a specialist is welcome for a responsible position. This idea that everything depends upon a thorough preparation has often, even against heavy odds, secured advantages for Germany in the market-places of the world. The

young German business man who goes to foreign shores has certainly prepared himself at home for his task by a serious study of the language and usages of his prospective customers, and he brings with him his price-lists carefully translated into the foreign idiom. No country in the world has based its technical industries on such broad foundations of thorough scholarship. Some industrial chemical establishments have in their employ several hundred scientific chemists who are exclusively engaged in scientific research. This scientific spirit alone has brought the German cultivation of the fields to its present intensiveness which compensates for the character of the soil. Agricultural academies and agricultural schools on all levels of scholarship and in all branches of agricultural knowledge have spread their thorough preparation to the remotest farms. The young factory employé receives a similar training in the specialistic technical continuation schools. Everywhere theory leads to a deeper grasp of the practical requirements. Europeans outside of Germany like to tell the story of an Englishman, a Frenchman, and a German who agreed to inform themselves about the hippopotamus, and for that purpose the Englishman traveled to Egypt, the Frenchman went to the zoölogical garden in Paris, and the German went to the library. Everyone has laughed at the rôle which the poor German plays there with his schol-

arly pedantry, but, seriously speaking, there can be hardly any doubt that after a short time the German would know far more about the hippopotamus than the other two. This German desire to make the mind independent of the personal chance impression and to substitute for the accidental the general which contains the experience of the whole race, has given to German labor much of its present ability to be successful in competition with much more favored countries. In short, the state and the individuals, the laws and the longings, the institutions and the emotions of the millions work together to make the Germany of to-day a tremendous working machine destined to success by hard labor — the same Germany which seems so freely given over to pleasure-seeking and æsthetic enjoyment.

One more apparent conflict in the modern Germany may be pointed out, and here it may be less possible to acknowledge the two sides as a twofold aspect of an underlying unity. Here we have a real inner contrast which is responsible for a certain unrest in the German life. But just this unrest is a condition for progress. The contrast is that between the belief in the rights of the individual and the belief in the rights of the community. The words alone would suggest that the same holds true of American life, but that would be misleading. The relation of the individual to his individual neighbor and to the nation as a whole is in America

very different from the German attitude. It might almost be said to be the reverse. Might we not hold that the whole development of America has been controlled by the conviction that the highest value lies in the individual? This was the Puritanic belief; this was the belief of the English law; ultimately the whole State and its organization has meaning and importance only in so far as it serves those millions of single individuals. Their freedom, their welfare, their spiritual growth, is the aim and end of everything in the national life. But while the right of the individual to welfare and perfection is the highest goal for the American, he tries to reach this end by subordinating himself to a community in which he aims to be as similar as possible to all the other members. His individuality is for him a center of his rights, but these rights are no different from the rights of his neighbors in the community. The whole American life with its longing for self-initiative and self-assertion, and yet with its subordination to the public opinion, to the fashion, to the taste of the masses, can be understood from this point of view. With the German it is just the opposite. For him the final aim is never the individual; his aim is the life and progress of the community, not as a mere summation of millions of individuals, but as an independent unity. The American would call it a mere abstraction, or even a mystical fancy, but the whole German life is controlled

by this belief in the real existence of the general mind as against the individual mind. To the German, science and art and religion and state are realities which everybody has to serve without any reference to personal men. He is loyal to them as ideals and not as means to serve any individuals in the world. This abstract community is the real goal of interests and the claims of any individuals must be subordinated to it.

On the other hand, this service to the rights of the community, this living for state and art and science and religion and progress is to be achieved by every one in his particular way. This to the German is the meaning of his individuality. It is not a source of special rights to him, but a source of special duties. All his particular gifts and tendencies must come to expression; he is not to fulfill the task just as his neighbor does, but he must feel that he is expressing himself in his incomparable uniqueness, and he demands that his neighbor also do it in his own way. His subordination to others means to him a prostitution of his eternal right to his inborn personality.

This fundamental German demand that each one do his share in his particular way gives to the German life its incomparable manifoldness and inner variety. No one will for a moment deny that virtues and vices lie near together in this, and that this feature of the typical German often leads to intolerable stubbornness

which paralyzes effective coöperation. All his little likes, and especially his little dislikes, his prejudices, and his moods must find their particular expression too. Every association becomes broken up in discordant groups, and in each group are as many opinions as members; every great party crumbles into smaller units because no one will give up the least fraction of his programme. This is, to be sure, a prolific source of perhaps unnecessary conflict. Any compromise appears a sin against the loyalty to one's convictions. A two-party system in politics would be unthinkable for Germany. The equilibrium in the German Reichstag is given essentially by four large groups, the Conservatives, the Liberals, the Clerical Catholics — the so-called Centrists — and the Socialists, but no effort to bring the Liberals, for instance, into one closed party has succeeded. They are separated into three smaller parties, and the Conservatives are likewise made up of three independent parties. Finally this manifoldness becomes more complicated by the special parties of the Polish, the Danish, and the Alsace-Lorraine groups in the Reichstag. The same diversity shows itself in the way in which every German State strives toward characteristic self-expression. In America, Kansas and Nebraska, and even Nevada and Montana are ultimately trying to be like New York and Pennsylvania; but Bavaria or Wurtemberg have not the least desire to

imitate Saxony or Prussia. Germany has no London and no Paris. However Berlin may grow, Munich and Hamburg, Cologne and Frankfort, and Leipzig and the rest will remain centers for important functions of German life. A real centralization would too seriously thwart the wish that everyone contribute his best in his own fashion. Accordingly the social life offers a greater manifoldness of personalities than American life would ever tolerate. The American feels that he is in society, that he plays a rôle, and that he is acknowledged as equal if he is not conspicuous and is behaving exactly like his set. The German, on the other hand, would feel that he was acknowledged as a full-fledged member of his set only if he had a particular feature to offer by which he was different from the others. This, it must be confessed, favors the outcrop of those who seek eccentricity in unimportant features down to the level of the cranks, but certainly it creates the most favorable conditions for the development of original minds, of individual talents and spiritual leadership. In America every month sees the appearance of new magazines because the old ones are so successful and the new ones want to imitate them: in Germany, too, every month sees the appearance of new magazines, but only because the editors of the new ones are convinced that all the old ones have been unsuccessful and they want to create something different. In every field

likeness to others means to the German a lack of individuality which destroys the right to exist.

We have recognized that this movement finds its counter-movement. The faithful belief in the independent value of the whole as a whole, without reference to the different individuals, necessarily creates the longing for a solid organization. In the field of politics this carries with it an enthusiastic devotion to everything which symbolizes the community as a whole. This is the real foundation of German monarchy. The nation as a totality is, from this German standpoint, not sufficiently expressed by the results of popular elections. They represent the struggles of individuals against individuals. But the symbol of the totality must be exempt from the opinions of individuals; it must lie beyond parties and conflicts; it must be inherited and thus given without reference to personal likes and dislikes. Here, too, elements of weakness naturally creep in; above all, the reliance on the inherited monarchy with its responsible cabinet government produces a regrettable political indifference on the part of the average German. To be sure, the Socialists, who fight for a new order of things, are eagerly on the battle-field, and the Centrists are stirred up to a good fight by the Catholic Church, and certain smaller groups are politically wide awake because they fight for economic interests. But the political party life as such suffers

from a widespread indolence. The typical German citizen without political ambitions does not take any trouble in state affairs because he feels vaguely that the government will take care that the interests of the community are protected. But in our time the mere confidence in the monarch and his government cannot alone secure the welfare of the community. In the complexity of modern life, with its gigantic technical achievements, the whole can never come to its own without a powerful organization. This belief in the efficiency of organization in the interest of the whole as a whole has become stronger and stronger in modern Germany. It has transformed the commercial life, it has molded the social movements, and it has finally begun to change the attitude of the individuals toward society. Public opinion, which is such an efficient organization of individual minds, has after all taken hold of the most modern life in Germany, and all its technical means such as the sensational newspaper and the muck-raking magazine have come to powerful existence. Even the fashion in the small and the large things has gained an importance which it never had before in German lands. The individual character feels himself threatened by the uniformizing tendency toward relentless organization.

Here we really have a conflict. The old German desire for individual diversity and the new belief in or-

ganization with its resulting uniformity of mind are two tendencies which cannot be completely harmonized. This antagonism of inner forces is the real problem which is at the bottom of all unrest among the Germans to-day.

THE GERMAN WOMAN

This essay first appeared in the Atlantic Monthly

THE GERMAN WOMAN

SUMMER before last on one of the first days after I had arrived in Berlin I took part in a large meeting devoted to the discussion of some problems of student life. A committee of leading professors had made a motion and some of the most influential men of Berlin spoke warmly in its favor. Then a young woman stood up and opposed it. She spoke quietly but firmly. There was strong objection to her arguments; eloquent speakers fought in favor of the original motion. But the young woman almost alone held her own and soon gained ground. When it finally came to a vote, the majority followed the banner of the young leader of the opposition. There were only a very few women in the whole assembly: it was distinctly the influence of woman's oratory over a large group of important men. Twenty years ago that would have been entirely impossible in Germany. A young woman would never have dared to take the lead in such a momentous debate, and if she had ventured to oppose acknowledged leaders, her mere effort would have been resented and this resentment would have swelled the other party. I felt

that a new time for the influence of German women in public life had come. A few weeks later I had to make a large number of appointments of secretaries, librarians and so on for the new Amerika-Institut of the German government. To all with whom I consulted it seemed from the start the most natural that I should appoint women, and accordingly I saw in my office scores of candidates who applied for the various positions. This gave me ample opportunity to become acquainted with the social standing of those young women who nowadays seek employment in Germany, and every hour reënforced my surprise at the greatness of the change. Most of them came from families who twenty years ago would have considered it impossible for their daughters to accept any paid positions or to seek an independent life activity. At about the same season I began my university lectures as Harvard Exchange Professor, and when I saw more than a hundred women students scattered among the men, in my lecture room, I could not help thinking of my student days when one solitary American woman was the spectacle and the sensation in the lecture courses which I attended in Leipzig. This revolution of affairs is most remarkable, and yet to everyone the new order seems a matter of course.

Soon afterward I was present at a great banquet at the seventieth birthday of a leading jurist. The best known professors of law made speeches and the cele-

brated guest of honor told in enthusiastic words how he had devoted his life to the idea that one nation ought to have one law. Then a young woman arose with a champagne glass in her hand. She brilliantly chose to interpret the words of the speaker to mean that the nation ought indeed to have one law only, that is, the same law for men and women, and that the women must therefore have the same rights as the men in public life. In all my life in the fatherland I had never before heard a woman making a toast at a public dinner. A few weeks later I myself spoke in the leading woman's club in Berlin. Who would have thought of women's clubs in Germany twenty years ago! That night everything looked exactly like a club in New York or Boston. The whole attitude of the audience, the introduction, the questions after the lecture, the refreshments, the whole make-up, everything, reminded me of well-known sights, and I should have believed myself to be in a real American woman's clubhouse, if the president had not finally led me to a beautiful little parlor over the entrance of which the sign said "smoking room." It was a room of cozy lounging places for the young ladies when they enjoy their cigarettes. I could not get rid of the question: where is my Germany of yesterday?

There cannot be any doubt that America and the American woman have a large share in these changes

of German public opinion. Of course such movements cannot come from without; mere imitation would be ineffective in questions which touch so deeply the inmost problems of the nation. The social organic conditions must be given in the inner life of the country, and it is not difficult to recognize the factors in Germany which necessarily led toward this change in woman's life. Nevertheless the far-reaching emancipation of women in American life and her important participation in the public functions of society have given a remarkable impulse to the German movement. The reasons why the American nation came so much earlier to an anticonservative view of women's rights are evident. The American view of life since the puritan days has been individualistic: the aim of society is the development of the individual. It is true that puritanism in itself did not favor the participation of women in public tasks, but this individualistic spirit of puritanism and of all American life philosophy necessarily forced American society to the acknowledgment of equal rights for women and men as personalities. The German view has been that the individual lives for the social good; the claims of the personality must therefore be subordinated to the claims of the community, and this devotion must begin in the smallest community, the family. Man and woman must live not for their own sake but for their family's sake. Hence the individual

wishes of the woman must be subordinated to her functions as member of the family.

But no less important than such a general philosophy of life was the difference in the practical conditions of the two countries. America was a pioneer land which had to be opened in a physical and in a social sense. This absorbed the energies of the men. Commercial, legal and political life took hold of the male population so completely that the higher cultural interests had to go over into the care of women, and that secured to them an independence which was not seldom cultural superiority. Furthermore America has still to-day one and a half million more men than women, while Germany has a million more women than men. This traditional scarcity of women necessarily created an over-estimation and a readiness to allow women an exalted place. Many other elements of American life have worked in the same direction. America became in the last century the most progressive country on earth in the question of women's rights. Slowly — in the eyes of many Germans and in the eyes of almost all Americans far too slowly — Germany has followed. But here, as in many other movements, it has proved that though Germany is very reluctant to enter a new path, as soon as it has entered it rushes forward on it with unexpected speed and energy. Certainly much still remains to be done, and he who listens to the radical

speeches of certain revolutionary reformers would fancy that the greatest part is still before us. But every sober spectator is bound to acknowledge that the change is simply astonishing, even if he does not sympathize with every feature of it. Yet we ought not to forget that while it is something new for recent Germany, it is not at all new for the Germans as historic people. The Germans of mediæval times were in the same situation in which the Americans were in their pioneer days. The men's hard work absorbed their energies so completely that every cultural interest, especially education and learning, was left to the church and the women. They were the refined element as against the barbaric men, and their superiority was acknowledged and sung. To learn from books was considered unmanly, and only after the renaissance began the time when the new scholarship became men's work. In the sixteenth century the German woman was decidedly considered the equal of man; in the seventeenth century man alone enjoyed the higher education and this scholarly education then became more and more the condition of professional life. The position of women steadily sunk, just through the inferiority of her education. It needed the concerted action at the end of the nineteenth century to bring again a fundamental change in the social possibilities of German women.

But it would be entirely misleading to fancy that this new German movement has a unified character. In reality it is a large number of movements which to a certain degree even interfere with one another and which have very different tendencies. Common to all of them is only the desire to improve the position of the female members of the social organism. The most conspicuous efforts of the women of the last decade were those which tried to secure open paths for the woman of unusual gifts. Such a movement was necessarily most visible because it dealt with a prominent few and not with the colorless masses. It was so easy to point out the injustice and the harm done to the community, if the genius of a talented woman had no chance for the highest development of its inborn energies. A woman with unusual talent, perhaps for scholarship in a special field, had to remain intellectually sterile because the highest schools were closed to her and the universities forbidden. The scientific life of the whole nation had to lose from such a narrow policy. This was the argument which appealed most easily to the German mind, and steadily the hindrances were removed. There is to-day no longer any reason whatever why any woman of unusual gifts should not enter into full competition with any man and should not reach the highest point of which her powers are capable. Public opinion even favors her work. And

yet it can hardly be said that this particular movement which refers to the cultural aristocracy of women has brought any important change. We see efforts upon efforts, but the total outcome is after all disappointing. The German experience demonstrates again what the experiences of more radical countries have shown before, that the creative work of women is fair and may represent highly estimable qualities and values, and certainly does not stand below the average of men's, but nowhere reaches the highest mark. Just as in America, in Germany too no woman has as yet attained a scholarly achievement of striking character, still less of true greatness. We must not forget that fields like literature and painting and music have always stood open to women and that there the same limitations have been observable. Germany has some splendid women painters and some delightful authoresses, but no one feels impelled to connect with their names the hopes for a new great upward movement. There is no one among them whom the Germans would compare with Arnold Böcklin the artist, with Gerhart Hauptmann the poet, or with Richard Strauss the musician. All that the women have given here as in America are some best sellers in fiction and their like in painting and scholarship.

The movement in favor of the exceptional woman is thus after all the least important and the least char-

acteristic. What has truly social significance and marks the change in the beginning of the twentieth century are those reforms which concern the millions, but here we have the greatest diversity of needs. To distinguish the chief directions we may acknowledge the following needs which had to be satisfied. The average woman of to-day, rich or poor, feels a longing for a serious interest and a significant content for her existence. The reform aimed to overcome the emptiness of woman's life. Second, millions of women have to earn their living. Their opportunities had been too limited and too little adjusted to modern society and to the technique of modern existence. The reform aimed to secure a decent livelihood for the unsupported woman. Quite different circles are touched by a third effort. The women of the lower classes found their time and energies absorbed by hard work which kept them away from the house and encroached upon their home life. For them a disburdening had to be sought in order again to give them an opportunity for dignified family life. The reform aimed to overcome the antidomestic effect of woman's labor. Fourthly, the married life meant subordination of the German woman. The reform aimed to secure equality between husband and wife. Fifthly, the average German woman was confined to domestic influence. She had no chance to become a power in the community. The

reform aimed to secure for her full influence in public life. There are many other partial tendencies in that great forward movement of recent years, but even the few which we have pointed out show with sufficient clearness the antagonism involved: the emptiness of the life of the upper classes demanded a change which would take the woman away from the home and the overburdening of the lower classes demanded a change which would bring the woman back to the home. Yet we can feel instinctively that there is a certain inner relation between all these movements and that it is no chance that they came into the foreground at the same time.

We spoke first of the emptiness of woman's life. It has often been pointed out how this was a necessary result of the great changes in the technical conditions of modern civilization. Domestic activity could really fill a busy woman's time in the past; it can no longer do so since weaving and knitting and baking and a hundred other good works of the German housewife of the past have long been taken out of the German woman's hands. Factory methods control the life of our time. Even the rearing of children has been simplified for the German mother through the modern division of work: her energies lack fit objects. Far from any question of money earning, the desire for a useful, regulated, systematic life activity was the necessary result of these

changed conditions. Of course the talents and inclinations show every possible variation and any single prescription would not have been sufficient to satisfy this millionfold need. But it was increasingly clear that more than superficial dilettantism was needed, that a more thorough achievement was sought than the traditional playing of the piano or reading of French novels. The essential basis for a new arrangement of woman's life was an improved education. The girls' school of Germany in the rather recent past stood incomparably below the boys' school. It was, measured by German standards, superficial and leading nowhere. The school career of a well-educated girl was completed at sixteen years, while her brothers went on with their much sharper work to the nineteenth year in school, then to go over into the university. All which led beyond the typical girls' school had a professional, normal school character. This has been fundamentally changed by the new institutions which the laws of a few years ago have established. The old schools have been greatly improved and above all they have been supplemented by a complex system of upper grade schools through which any possible goal of an intelligent girl can be reached. She may go on to the same examination which the boys have to pass in order to enter the university, or she may seek a higher humanistic education without any university end in view, or she may

enter higher schools for special professional preparation: in short, she can secure in regular channels without any difficulties and without finding any prejudices an independent serious lifework and may develop her personality and prepare herself for her rôle in the community as well as in a refined and stimulating home. Anyone who examines carefully those new regulations must acknowledge that they are almost radical and that the German governments after a too long period of neglect, under the influence of the new demands have gone almost to an extreme, offering especially in the so-called "lyceum" schools a more complex thoroughly modern course than the energies of young women are likely to be able to carry through. Certainly their chances are now not inferior to those of boys, and yet in a careful deliberate way the whole work is adjusted to the special interests and special spheres of womanhood.

Public opinion has completely adjusted itself to this new order. In every family—in the large cities especially, but slowly the change has entered the small towns too—it seems beyond discussion that the daughter prepare for a definite line of activity. The girl who does a little embroidery and otherwise waits for the fiancé to come is dying out. The German experience seems to confirm the American one that under this new rule the fiancé may come a little later but not less cer-

tainly. It is true that many a girl with a serious life interest now refuses a husband whom her mother at her time would have accepted because she would have dreaded the emptiness of an unmarried life, but just on this account the marriage which she finally prefers is on a higher level.

Of course the problem of life interest cannot be separated from the question of life support. The girl of the well-to-do house who pursues university courses or devotes herself to the activities of the social worker may follow certain lines of interest which would never yield an earning sufficient to pay for her gloves. But on the whole even those women who are well supported are encouraged in their serious devotion to earnest work by the side thought that in possible days of need their training may make them independent. For by far the larger part of the population the practical side of the question stands in the foreground from the start. Two economic conditions force this on Germany much more than on America. The great difference in the number of the male and female population, giving to the adult women a lead of a million make it necessary that there remain by far more women unmarried in Germany than in the United States, the more as a tenth of the adult men prefer to remain bachelors. Most of these unmarried women are obliged to seek their livelihood. On the other hand the wages of the laboring

classes are low and make it in a higher degree than in America necessary that wives and daughters contribute by their labor to the earnings of the family. Hence the number of female breadwinners in Germany is exceedingly large.

In America not more than 14.3% of the whole female population is engaged in gainful occupations as against 61.3% of the male. Moreover even this 14.3% becomes still much smaller when only the native white of native parentage are considered, as the average for the whole country results from the extremely strong participation of the negro women. In Germany the percentage of working men is the same as in America, 61.1%, but the percentage of working women is 30.4%. Almost ten million women are breadwinners in Germany. There are 3.5 millions of women engaged in industrial work and business as against 10.8 million men, and especially characteristic of the German situation seems the figure that 738,000 women are independent owners and heads of establishments. 1.3 millions are laborers in factories. In the textile industries for instance the women are in the majority, 400,000 women as against 371,000 men. In the clothing industry 228,000 women stand against 97,000 men.

If the intensity of the woman movement were to be measured simply by the amount of participation of women in the work of the nation, the German women

would have had for a long while no reason whatever for complaint. It could always have been shown to them that even in America the women had a much smaller part in the labor. But the true progress of woman's rights demands of course a very different standard. The aim must be to disburden woman from the labor which injures her home life, and on the other side to open for her the fields of higher activity. In both respects the last years have shown a decided improvement, and all the more characteristic efforts of systematic reform are concentrated on these points. The higher professions like those of the physician, of the high school teacher, and similar engagements which in Germany demand four years and more of graduate university work are now open to women under the same conditions as to men. The number of women students at the university this year is about twenty-four hundred. But in a way, still more important is the great variety of occupations fit and favorable for women which do not demand university graduate work and which have been conquered by women in recent years. All German states nowadays allow the appointment of female factory inspectors and industrial inspectors, a calling in which on account of the great number of female workers women can be most beneficially at work. A much favored career for women is also that of the librarian, which only a few years ago was still unknown

as an occupation for women, while to-day in Berlin alone two large librarian schools supply Germany with more female librarians than the public libraries can possibly use. The important service as professional nurse with long systematic training in the hospitals has become another much sought function for the daughters of educated families. Literary and artistic work, especially arts and crafts, high class gardening and fancy farming, interior decoration and artistic photographing, management of bureaus for typewriting and translating and a hundred similar half-professional activities for intelligent and energetic young women are eagerly sought to-day.

How far this new type of female breadwinners is successful or not, it may be too early to judge. Public opinion is still somewhat undecided. In former times when the better educated women in cases of need had practically no other resources than working as elementary teachers in girls' schools or as piano teachers, as housekeepers or as governesses, or in small business enterprises, there was no criticism and no doubt as to their fitness. They undertook the characteristically female work in the community and no competition with men stirred up the discussion. Now it is different. Almost all the new callings have been taken away from men, and in this economic struggle of the sexes the characteristic qualities have come to sharper expres-

sion. Deciding qualities there are, of course, not only the personal ones but also the social, especially the woman's freedom from financial obligation for the support of a family. Woman is therefore everywhere able to underbid man. The dangerous consequences which have resulted from this social condition in the United States in the teachers' profession, where teaching has entirely gone over into the hands of the women as lowest bidders, have not shown themselves in the school situation of Germany. This is made impossible by the fact that with the exception of the rural primary schools there is hardly any coeducation in Germany, and Germany stands out against women teachers in the boys' schools, while it at the same time insists on a strong participation of male teachers in girls' schools. All this is settled by state law and the mere underbidding of salaries can have no influence on this general principle. But in every other field the competition is strongly felt. The girl who lives in the house of her parents and wants to earn only a little spending money and moreover expects to get married, may easily do the secretarial or library or artistic work for a salary which a man would feel to be inadequate. As far as the character of the work itself is concerned it is only natural that there should be widespread complaint about a certain lack of physical strength which brings quick fatigue and too frequent interruptions by little ailments

in times of hard work. But it is more surprising that complaint is so often heard about carelessness, lack of accuracy and thoroughness, even of disorderliness, the same type of objections which the university professors make as to the female students in the laboratories and hospitals.

There is no doubt that the practical success has not been complete and the outcome has been even to many friends of the woman movement a distinct disappointment. Some claim that this is necessary, that in a land which makes such high demands on the accuracy and thoroughness of man, woman will never be perfectly an equal, and that a reaction against the present onrush of women toward the higher callings will soon set in. Others insist that the period of readjustment has so far been too short, that too little experience existed for every woman to find the really fitting place and that all the complaint will disappear as soon as a still much larger expansion of her professional activity has been developed. Certainly one antiprofessional feature cannot and ought not to be removed. Just this type of active intelligent women who create an important life work are marrying like others: they marry late but finally their marriage too closes their career. The number of female physicians who are really practicing in Germany is very small compared with the number of those who are prepared for it. The others have gen-

erally married and have given up their medical ambition. It cannot be doubted that this interferes greatly with the enthusiasm of the teachers who are to prepare women for a higher calling, and similarly the whole country cannot fully overcome the feeling that there is a lack of seriousness, almost an element of play and of dillettantism in the work because neither the women themselves nor the spectators really believe that it will be their calling to their life's end. But it would be unfair to deny that there is also no lack of praise for the positive qualities of the woman's contribution to the nation's higher tasks. All agree that the women are industrious and eager, that they bring an element of freshness, humanity and moral inspiration into the business of the day and that they do their work with patience and discretion and serenity. The chief success which is beyond dispute is that they have eliminated the prejudices of their parents' time. Even those who are skeptical as to the objective results have long ago given up repeating the old-fashioned arguments that the daughter of an educated family ought to confine herself to the sphere of the home.

This however does not touch that circle of thoughts which appear to some as prejudice too, but which has a right to demand more consideration: is this public life work in harmony with the functions of woman as a wife and mother? Again it may be said that Germany has

not come to inner clearness on this point. Many German physicians argue seriously that the strenuous occupation makes too many tender girls unfit or less fit for later motherhood. Her physical energies are exhausted and she enters into married life less strong. Sympathizers reply that the burdens of the old-fashioned housewife and house-daughter were often more exacting and exhausting than any position as librarian or secretary. Moreover they insist that the discipline and the intellectual training which the well-educated breadwinner gains through her calling is a perfect training for her true duties as wife and mother and that as preparation it is far superior to the idleness to which nowadays most girls of that social standing would be condemned.

It is evident that almost no one of these arguments holds for the work of the lower classes. In a certain degree the situation is almost the reverse. The physical injury to the organism by the constant exhausting labor, the lack of free time for any inner development and even for the cultivation of her home activities, the paralyzing monotony of her factory work: all is surely antagonistic to the desirable status of individual and family life. Here therefore the reform has taken the opposite character. The aim has been, not to expand the woman's work but to reduce it and to protect the working woman against injurious demands. This

element of the woman movement was at first somewhat in the background or rather it was at first left to the Social-Democratic political party. The real so-called woman movement in Germany started with refined women who were more touched by the inner misery of empty lives of women in their own layer of society than by the suffering of the lower classes of which they knew little and which seemed to them more or less inevitable. The cries for help in these lower social regions naturally appealed more to those who were not interested in the position of woman and man but in the position of poor and rich. The socialistic warcry in the interest of the women workers was therefore "Down with capital!" The tremendous growth of Social Democracy in political Germany was to a high degree due to its effective and sincere fight for the laboring woman. But in the meantime the social conscience of all Germany has been stirred up, sympathy for the laboring population has led to those unparalleled efforts of state insurance and factory legislation by which the women have profited as much as the men. At the same time the trade unions have grown rapidly and are dominating industrial life as perhaps nowhere else; and here again the women have their full share. More and more has the non-socialistic public movement in the interest of women turned to this field and through the efforts of brilliant women leaders recent

years have witnessed reforms of really organic character. It has become increasingly clear that the characteristic difficulties of women at work are untouched by the problem of socialism. It has been felt that the real difficulty was lying in the fundamental fact that through the changes in the modern home life and technique woman has been forced into an industrial life which has been shaped in adjustment to the energies of men. This has involved a misuse of the female organism and the great demand of the women reformers to-day is for a better adjustment between woman and work. Under their influence the reforming tendencies have turned no less to those who were entirely helpless because they were entirely scattered, the servant girls, the waitresses, even the agricultural workers and on a higher level the business employés. Organized associations have been formed for all of them, with and without political or religious background, and almost all of them aim toward social and cultural improvements as well as toward the strictly economic and legal ones.

The progress of women in that conquest of the professions and in the improvement of legislation regarding female work can be proved by figures and illustrations, but much of the best which these movements have brought to modern Germany cannot be demonstrated or measured and does not show on the

surface at all. Yet the careful observer who knew the Germany of a quarter of a century ago and who now comes in contact with a great variety of homes must notice a thorough change which for the national life is perhaps more important than any question of woman study and of woman labor. The essential point is that the position of woman in the structure of the family has become more dignified by the development of a stronger sense of comradeship between husband and wife. The German family life has always been healthy and sound: in the home has always lain the strength of the community. There has never been lack of love in the typical German house, but all the feelings of affection went together with a sincere belief in inequality. The woman did not feel that as unfair or unjust, inasmuch as it had been a German tradition since the seventeenth century that the wife in all intellectual and non-domestic questions naturally should subordinate herself to her master. She was accustomed to be guided, and while of course her personality gave warmth and meaning to the home, she herself felt it as her ideal duty to devote her energies to the building up of a home which received its stamp from the husband. This attitude has passed. The better education of the women, their greater importance in public life, the disappearance of the old-fashioned prejudices, the greater leisure of present-day women for intellect

tual interests and the constant airing of women problems have quietly worked together to convince men that the place of woman in the home is a place of equality and that true comradeship can intertwine with real love. The frequent commanding tone in which the cheaper kind of men so long indulged in their intercourse with their wives would to-day be considered simply as rudeness and would not be tolerated by anyone. Nor would the right kind of woman, however ready she would be in her love to make the greatest sacrifice for her husband, any longer think of that self-effacement which to previous generations so often appeared as woman's natural share. The German woman of to-day would not be afraid of the hardship in it, but she would shrink from the indignity. This new group of ideas does not begin to work on the wedding day. It determines no less the choice of the companion for life. The ideal of the young man is no longer the girl without thoughts of her own. Certainly the immature marriages at a very early age seem to decrease. To-day the age of the girl at which the greatest number of marriages occur is twenty-three. Only 25,000 girls marry at the age of nineteen or twenty, 39,000 at the age of twenty to twenty-one, 52,000 at twenty-one to twenty-two, 55,000 at twenty-two to twenty-three, 53,000 at twenty-three to twenty-four and 47,000 at twenty-four to twenty-five. For men the maximum of marriages

too. The percentage of female suicides in relation to male suicides has grown in the last ten years from 26% to 29%. But there is no progress without its cruelties. The new freedom and the new responsibility will demand their victims and will unbalance many a weak personality, but they will grow steadily and beneficially.

The movement to equal rights and to emancipation from mere obedience was from the beginning not limited to the circle of the home. The new influence was more modestly and yet persistently exerted in public life. The demand for equal suffrage, to be sure, has remained entirely in the background. Those elements which give to the suffrage movement in America its greatest strength, the desire for the purification of politics and for the elimination of corruption and graft, and on the other hand the need of women in the legislature in order to secure industrial legislation favorable to women, are both inapplicable and negligible for the German situation. The women themselves feel that their suffrage would simply duplicate the number of votes, without changing anything in the character of the parties or of the legislature. But all the more are the reformers eager to secure for the women an influential share in public functions, for instance in municipal offices, in the school's administration, in the public care for the poor, in the inspection of factories and domiciles, in police positions and many similar activi-

ties. The number of such positions is growing from year to year with the enlarged supply of well-trained women. Correspondingly the women with steady persistence fight for their representation in chambers of commerce, chambers of agriculture, chambers of industry and so on. The advance here is extremely slow and while the woman who owns a business has a right to have her firm represented in the elections for the chambers of commerce, she herself cannot be elected. The German women who seek advance in any public lines know well that there cannot be rights without duties. They know that the real demand of the hour for the progressive woman is the study of social problems and an earnest training in social activities. Excellent schools for the social education of women have been established and a corps of well-trained helpers and reformers is growing up to-day and will do more for the spreading of progressive ideas than the mere declamations of the radical orators, whose time has on the whole passed away in the woman movement of Germany.

occurs at the age of twenty-six. Of course Germany too shows one effect of the new order of things which seems necessarily to belong to such a more liberal view of woman's position, the increase of divorces. In the years 1903 to 1907 the average among 100,000 inhabitants was still only 18.8 divorces, in 1908 it had already grown to 21.2, and the statistics show clearly that the figures are lowest in the least developed parts of Germany, in the eastern provinces in which the old order of ideas prevails, and highest in the most progressive parts, especially in the large cities. In Berlin there are 87 divorces among 100,000 inhabitants, in Hamburg 76. One other figure may raise still more doubt as to the degree of happiness which the change has brought to womanhood. The increase of divorces may still be interpreted as not meaning subjective unhappiness. On the contrary it may indicate that in earlier times women had to suffer lifelong misery in marriages which they are now more ready to give up in order to gain their freedom. But there cannot be two interpretations of the other figure which indicates that the number of female suicides has also relatively increased. And it is characteristic that this increase is not only a participation in the general tendency to suicide which may be the result of the more complicated conditions of present-day life, but the number of female suicides in relation to the male suicides has grown,

CO EDUCATION

This essay first appeared in the Ladies Home Journal

COEDUCATION

WHEN the scientific work of women in the universities is under discussion, I am quite proud of my noble record on the side of the coeducationalists. When I opened my psychological laboratory in the German university of Freiburg twenty-five years ago, I was the first there who had women among the men in higher research, and from that year to the present day, at first in Germany and now for many years in America, I have not conducted my laboratory for a single day without having some feminine psychologists in constant coöperation with masculine doctor candidates. And if I recall the long line of women who took their psychological doctor's degree after years of such co-educational studies under my charge, I hardly think they can be equaled. There were Mary Whiton Calkins, whose psychological contributions have made a decided impression on the development of psychology, Ethel Puffer, whose "Psychology of Beauty" stands foremost in American æsthetics, Eleanor Rowland, whose "Right to Believe" is a little masterpiece of philosophical discussion, and many others. I hope

many still will follow and every one will be most welcome in our company of men scholars. Nevertheless I profess my belief that the high schools and above all the colleges ought not to be coeducational, and that co-education ought not to begin below the level of graduate work.

Those who want to exclude women from the men's colleges at once fall under the suspicion of trying to hold down the girls of the land to an inferior level and of wanting to exclude them from the benefits of highest education. In reality, as matters stand to-day, the problem of coeducation in college ought to be discussed entirely without reference to the right of women to highest intellectual culture. Thirty years ago the matter stood otherwise. If women wanted scholarly education, the straightest way to the goal seemed to be to admit them to the institutions of men. To-day there is no need of defending the claims of women; the women themselves have declared with pride that the battle is now won. We no longer hear the old-fashioned pitiful arguments that the women have too small a brain for study, or that their health breaks down if they go through a college course, or that they lose charm and become unwomanly if their education goes beyond the finishing school, or that they are bad housekeepers and selfish mothers if they have too much intellectual training. All these exaggera-

tions which belonged to a period of transition have melted away. The social prejudices have disappeared and anyone who should argue to-day against the principle of college education for women would appear a relic of by-gone times.

But just because this question of the day before yesterday can be eliminated to-day, we ought to be without prejudice in discussing the entirely different question of whether in the period from the fourteenth to the twenty-second year the education of boys and girls in the same classroom is desirable or not. The problem is usually recognized as that of coeducation versus segregation. But this latter term too easily suggests from the start that an injustice is done and that separation is effected where naturally unity ought to prevail. It emphasizes merely the negative side and does not indicate at all that an independent education of the girls and boys can have a positive purpose and a positive advantage. We ought rather to suggest by our terms that that for which we are pleading is a special education for men and a special education for women adapted to their particular needs. From this point of view I should prefer to label this discussion bieducation versus coeducation. It indicates the demand for two independent types of education. The word is formed like bimetallism, but what it expresses is far better than the bimetallistic claim.

We believers in bieducation would not for a moment think of closing our research work, our laboratories and our most advanced institutions of the graduate school to any well-prepared women. Nor would we have anything to say in favor of separated medical schools or law schools or divinity schools or technological schools. As soon as professional work begins, all separation of the sexes would be meaningless and undesirable. Much of that work simply cannot be doubled, and for most of it duplication would be an inexcusable waste. The legal instruction of the feminine lawyer must be exactly the same as that of the man, if she is ever to be a useful member of the bar. If any social arguments speak against such professional work in common, they are decidedly subordinated to the rigid demands of the vocation. But just the essential point which cannot be emphasized too much is that high schools and colleges ought not to be conceived of as vocational institutions. They are to serve the culture of women and men as against the vocational training. A demarcation line must be drawn between the college on the one side and the professional school on the other side, if the highest interests of society are to be served, and as soon as this demarcation line is recognized, the different methods seem a matter of course. The bieducational scheme is the ideal for the years of cultural education.

There are too many who in the rush of the market have lost the feeling for this essential difference. They would like to carry the demands of the earning vocation down into college, into high school and into the primary school. They fancy that everything which is not directly useful for the vocational technique is a waste of time and energy. They have stuffed our colleges with practical subjects and have allowed far-reaching choice of courses in the high schools under the one point of view that only that which is directly applicable to the future trade can be worth while. If this tendency were to win the day, the lifework would be built up on thinner and thinner foundations of real culture and our society would be more and more threatened by uneducated experts. The whole cultural level of our community would sink, and while the earning power of the individuals might not suffer immediately, the value of this whole fabric and the worthiness of our social life would rapidly diminish. It is most fortunate that our time shows a strong and healthy reaction against such superficial tendencies. The signs are evident which indicate that the belief in a cultural basis is gaining a stronger hold. The community feels with increasing earnestness that ultimately the general education counts more than anything for the lifework of the nation and that any professional training without such a basis is shallow and finally inefficient. The women

above all have every interest to stand for this broader ideal. The historical development of the nation has created a public situation in which the women have become the real guardians of the national culture. While the men had to work as pioneers, had to open the land and to organize business and politics, the women had to protect the ideal interests. If they too were to yield to the shortsighted view which disregards culture and would like to transform the school time into a mere period of apprenticeship for practical trades, the future of the country would be most seriously threatened.

Two possibilities, it seems, lie before us. Either this tendency to early professionalism will become victorious and the colleges and high schools will be more and more transformed into places of vocational training. Or the reaction against this professionalism will win the day and the schools and colleges will be once more saved for a real cultural influence, removed from the technical work of the vocational schools. No one to-day can foresee whether the one or the other possibility will become realized. The chances are great that neither of the two tendencies will be entirely defeated. The one will remain more prevalent in certain parts of the country, the other in other parts of the country. But this is clear. The consequence with regard to coeducation or bieducation ought to be the

same in either of the two cases. In either case it will be necessary and desirable in the highest interests of future society that the women receive their education separated from the men.

If professionalism wins the day, the college courses will become more and more practical; the natural science courses will become more and more technical and adjusted to the needs of the manufacturer and the engineer, the historical and economic courses will be more and more shaded for the practical use of the lawyer and politician. In short, the lectures of the college will lose their cultural value and will be short-cuts to the market-places of the world. The fear that this may happen is strongly suggested to everyone who watches the changes in our public life. We see how the most different factors of our social surroundings are influenced and tainted by the low, practical, materialistic instincts. We see how the press of the country has become sensational, how the theaters are brought down to the level of farce, and how the social struggle gradually becomes adjusted to the selfish desires. Would it be surprising if the institutions of learning also should yield to the pressure of the lower instincts and devastate the traditions of ideal culture in the interest of schemes for "getting rich quick?" Every serious citizen will hope that this time may not come but where it shows its symptoms, there indeed

one consequence must be absolutely demanded: Keep the future wives and mothers and teachers away from such breeding places of uneducated professionalism. The more the man's college becomes practical, the more the woman's college must be segregated from it. The woman can remain the guardian of American culture only if her place of education is filled with the spirit of an ideal belief in the value of that which is true and good and beautiful without reference to its market price. Such cultural study as against professional study does not mean a smattering knowledge of a hundred things fit to be talked about over the teacups, nor does it mean a superficial polish or a purely literary education. Nor does it necessarily mean Greek or Latin or fine arts. But it does mean an harmonious development of the human energies, an educated attitude toward life with an ability to see the small things small and the great things great, to value the ideals of life and to be trained in an earnest devotion to truth and beauty and morality.

But let us hope that the other possible development may bless the future of our country. Let us hope that the spirit of cultural idealism may prevail and that school and college may be kept free from the selfish demands of the trades. Must we not then demand still more seriously that the woman's college and the man's college go on separate ways? To give to boys and

girls true culture certainly does not mean to give them during the years of adolescence the same influences and the same control. A few years ago when one of the leading eastern universities discussed the problem of opening its doors to women in contradiction to its old traditions, the decisive argument against it was that the college ought to remain a place of culture, and that culture for men means a virile culture. A man's college ought above all to be a school of manly character and a place of training in a manly attitude toward the problems of thought and life, not simply a scholar factory. This is the thought which has so far excluded women from those colleges which stand most earnestly for the cultural character of the studies, from Harvard, Yale, Columbia and Princeton, however hospitable their professional and graduate schools are to the feminine scholars. But if a characteristic, virile culture is the ideal of many of the leading men's colleges, there cannot be any doubt that the girl's colleges must stand for an equally characteristic culture for women.

Whoever overlooks this difference is subconsciously influenced by the thought of professional training, which is indeed alike for both. But whoever understands that culture means harmonious development of the mind and the securing of attitudes and perspectives, love for the unselfish aims of life and fullest power in

the characteristic realm, must see that a mere imitation of men's culture would lead to a sham culture for women. There is no use in telling us that men and women have the same intellect and the same will and the same interests. The question is not how they appear isolated, looked on without reference to society and to the social unit of the family. With equal justice the anatomist may show us that the right hand and the left hand have the same number of fingers and that the fingers of each are of corresponding length and that the whole anatomical structure is exactly the same — and yet we would try in vain to put the right glove on the left hand. If women are really to gain true culture, serviceable to the harmonious life of the community, it must be shaped under influences which are adjusted to their true needs. A sexless co-culture is nothing but pseudo-culture. Whoever has had the good fortune to spend a few days on the campus and in the halls of Bryn Mawr or Wellesley, of Vassar or Smith or Mt. Holyoke, of Barnard or Radcliffe, must surely have felt that the beauty and the glory, the strength and the value of these colleges result just from the fact that they are not simply copies of men's institutions.

But the demands of the community are not confined to that which may be expected of woman's intellectual and emotional culture. The true life of woman can-

not be conceived without relation to men, and the educational fiction of a neutral being must be dangerous to the state, like any other fiction which ignores the real facts. The consciousness of the difference between boys and girls in the years of their best development is necessarily a background of their normal growth. Co-education can have in this respect two different possible influences, both of which are equally undesirable. Either this feeling of difference becomes unwholesomely suppressed or it becomes abnormally sharpened. Indeed it is quite possible — careful observers can often watch this effect in coeducational institutions — that the consciousness of difference between boy and girl may become dulled. Then there remains nothing of that often claimed advantage that the boys become refined by the presence of the girls and that the girls become strengthened by the presence of the boys, but both become simply insensitive to the presence of the other. The common school task absorbs their attention and over their Latin and Geometry the girls forget that shirtwaists and skirts do not fit everyone. Of course some would say that this is just the ideal situation and that feeble sentimentality of the boys and girls in the years of sexual tension is replaced by thoughts of intellectual work. But while there is no need of unhealthy sentimentality, it is not desirable from the standpoint of society that nature be tricked by such

artificial sexlessness. The girls who see how stupidly those boys behave in the classroom lose that natural instinct which together with hunger is doing the most to move the machinery of social life. Normal instincts can never be suppressed without social vengeance. There is no worse form of race suicide than the annihilation of those feelings by which boys and girls are attracted to each other as boys and girls.

But coeducation produces perhaps still more often the opposite effect. The sexual tension is reënforced. As the President of the University of Wisconsin says with regard to coeducational colleges: "There is undoubtedly a tendency among the women to regard as successful the one who is attractive to the young men — in other words social availability rather than intellectual leadership is regarded by at least a considerable number of the young women as the basis of a successful college career." There is no reason to argue against collegiate coeducation with reference to any dangers of vicious immorality. Experience has shown that opposition from this quarter can be ignored. But the amount of flirtation and effort to play for the other sex which has grown up in the coeducational places is certainly adverse to the spirit of college work. The whole atmosphere in which the girl moves in such a co-educational college is too easily "tingling with the nervousness of a continuous social function." No

doubt at a time when a certain inner repose, a certain unity of purpose and inner harmony would be most needed, a constant artificial excitement and over-tension is harming the blossoming youth. The social element and the contact with young men is a most desirable supplement to the years of female college education. But the educational and the social functions must not be intermingled. The college as such is not the right place for the stimulation of the interest in men.

Of course nature sets limits to such artificial maneuvering, and consequently we see one further result of coeducation which is undesirable in every respect. By instinct the boys and girls correct the mistake of their educators. When they are brought into the same college with the chance to take the same courses, they introduce bieducation by choosing different courses. Some subjects thus simply become studies for girls, carefully avoided by the male students, and others become the monopoly of the men, never approached by the average girl. This development seems almost unavoidable. A cultural course which is at first taken by boys and girls alike and which is equally important for both is likely to find the girls more eager and attentive than the boys. The girls are therefore doing superior work and the result is that the boys feel uncomfortable in the course. In the

following year, accordingly, fewer men choose it, and as soon as the girls are in a decided majority the boys feel out of place. Their little group is huddled together in a corner while the classroom belongs to the feminine corps. From that time on the course has entirely lost its grasp on the male students. The same development naturally occurs in those courses which the boys need and like. The girls are finally ostracized there and the ultimate outcome is a segregation which has all the disadvantages of coeducation together with the possible weaknesses of bieucation. This most natural development of different choice of courses has already had a most harmful influence on the universities themselves. The cultural courses become more and more shaped for the girls and the others become more and more technical. In this way both groups of students become absurdly limited in their choice of subjects and in the width of their horizon.

The boys and girls thus instinctively segregate themselves wherever they have the chance. We can hardly doubt that if it were left to their own inclination, the majority would prefer this division also in those cases where they have no chance for it. The experiment of a Chicago high school is characteristic. The school began three years ago with a programme according to which the students recited all lessons in separated classes. At the end of the first half year a referendum

of the parents was taken as to the question of whether the parents found that the child was benefited by being in a segregated class and whether they would advise that the plan be extended to the next incoming class. Ninety per cent. answered both questions in the affirmative. After a further year of trial a second referendum was taken with a much enlarged number of students and again eighty-five per cent. were decidedly in favor of segregation. Pupils and parents both liked the plan. The pupils say that they get closer together, understand one another better and are not afraid of being criticised.

But it is not only the question of liking, nor is it merely the question of culture and of social demands; it is to a high degree also a question of educational technique. Our high schools and our colleges cannot reach the highest degree of pedagogical efficiency if two such unlike groups of pupils are mixed together. No one ought to say, as is too often done in partisan discussions, that the mind of the boy is superior to that of the girl or vice versa. It is not a question of better or worse. They are simply two different kinds of minds. This does not exclude our sometimes finding girls who show the characteristic features of men's minds just as we find boys who have distinctly the feminine type of mind. The high school and the college are in no way to be adjusted to exceptions,

neither to the boyish girl nor to the girlish boy, nor even to the genius who breaks all barriers. We want our public institutions to be for the average boy and girl, and for them it remains true that distinct differences of mental behavior can easily be observed. In our day of experimental psychology the facts have been brought down to exact data. We know to-day that the thought and the imagination, the memory and the attention of the boys and girls are characteristically different, we know that the whole rhythm of development is unlike and that on the higher levels their tendency to concentration, to suggestibility, to mental resistance, to productiveness, to emotion and to will action, shows important differences. It is entirely meaningless to say that the one is more excellent than the other, but it is very clear that to force both to the same work in the same rhythm must be a handicap for both. It is exactly as the principal of that Chicago high school reports, who made the experiment with the segregation of classes. He says: "In the mixed classes neither one helps the other, as each is impatient to go on in his or her own course. I wish to deny the implication that boys are superior to girls, because they finally become or may become intellectual leaders, or that girls are superior to boys as shown by the scholarship records of every secondary school. Our experiment has shown me that each is superior

in the other sex in the traits of character and the kind of intellect nature requires of each. We, the educators, have been at fault in not recognizing that men and women live and move in parallel courses and that at the beginning of that period when nature is trying to differentiate the sexes, we have been working against her by providing identical instruction, as if the life-work of each was to be the same." How much more must this be true of the college period in which nature not only is trying to differentiate the sexes but has succeeded in differentiating them.

The theorists of the opposite side are simply misled by the phantasm of human uniformity. Such an illusory argument may have done its service when it was time to fight for the admission of women to collegiate education. Then it may have been wise to emphasize those features which indicate equality of intellect and therefore equality of rights. But as such a discussion is obsolete and as no one any longer disputes the rights of women to highest education, we come nearer to the truth and therefore nearer to ideal conditions, if we frankly acknowledge that the inequality has its claims too. The cry for uniformity is in all social problems valuable only as a war cry against some unjust and unreasonable discrimination. In periods of peace progress demands division of labor, and that is differentiation. To make society uniform is always moving

downward. The recognition of the different aims and duties, of the different types of intellects and of emotion, of the different rhythms of development and of the different predominant interests must be to-day the most important demand in American education. This true progress can be secured only through bieducational work.

THE HOUSEHOLD SCIENCES

*This essay first appeared in the Good Housekeeping
Magazine*

THE HOUSEHOLD SCIENCES

IN our American university world only one tendency remains really constant: the tendency to change. Every decade, every year, brings new movements and new experiments, new inspirations and new fads, new truths and new errors. The educational unrest which pervades the pedagogical efforts of our country in every stage from the kindergarten upwards, finds indeed in the college its most important outlet. This unrest is not blameless in all cases. It is often the expression of haste and superficiality, of social nervousness and almost of hysterical desire for changes: moreover its aims are not seldom mere notoriety by eccentricity or advertisement, and attractive power by cheap indulgence to popular fancies. Yet fundamentally this unrest in the college world and these frequent changes and experiments are the signs of a wholesome and most desirable situation. The American college would never fulfill its glorious mission for the nation if it were not ready to accept and to realize ever new ideas and suggestions.

By far the most characteristic movement of the last

decade was the wonderful development of the western state universities. It is an exaggeration to claim, as the enthusiasts of the middle west sometimes do claim, that no western boy has any longer a reason for going to Harvard or Yale, Columbia or Johns Hopkins or Princeton, no western girl for going to Bryn Mawr or Radcliffe, to Wellesley or Vassar or Smith. Some good reasons do remain, and they mean more than a mere worship for a long history and its traditions; there is an atmosphere and a spirit which can only slowly grow up in the new centers of learning. Persons who can afford it will probably for a long while still continue to send their sons and their daughters East, and what they bring home with their bachelor's degree will be more than mere social prestige and more than the knowledge which they might as well have gained within their state boundaries. Nevertheless the influence of the new development is tremendous and the eastern colleges feel it distinctly. The state universities are the crowning parts of public education paid for by the public taxes and therefore open to the student at the payment of only a nominal fee; the old colleges are endowed institutions and however rich, yet dependent upon not inconsiderable fees. Accordingly the economic conditions greatly favor the attendance at the western seats of education. Above all, the state university draws young people into college life who with-

out this stimulation would never have thought of a higher education. In the state of New York for every one hundred thousand inhabitants less than two hundred of their sons and daughters are in college, in Illinois two hundred and thirty, in Wisconsin two hundred and forty-six. These much heralded figures do not mean quite so much as it may appear; the youth of New York more frequently go to New England or to New Jersey than the western boys leave their state; moreover the entrance conditions do not stand on the same level. But they surely indicate a splendid trend toward the enterprising and enthusiastic western universities, and perhaps give a useful warning to the eastern trustees of wisdom that they must not rest on old laurels.

But this internal growth and rivalry became much more significant by the arising of distinctly new university ideas in the new centers of scholarship. The nation experienced not simply a duplication or multiplication of that which existed before, but the vigorous spirit of the West created original forms of educational influence and almost new types of educational ideals. This moreover was not confined to the state universities, but endowed institutions like the University of Chicago had their important share: they all were bristling with new plans and new-fashioned if not revolutionary principles. Was the new always the good?

The East was often inclined to doubt it. A mere change is not necessarily an improvement. Much appeared trivial, much hasty, much imprudent, not a few variations from the older types were evidently nothing but adjustments to a less refined state of intellectual culture and to youth with poorer preparation and with less academic aims. The result was a somewhat condescending attitude on the part of the eastern seaboard. Yet this did not prevent the old universities from repeating some of those modern innovations and experiments. To a certain degree they were forced to it by the demands of rivalry; they did not wish to lose ground in the West for the sake of remaining national and not becoming provincial. To a greater degree they imitated unconsciously because some ideas which cropped out in the West spread quickly and became part of the general pedagogical creed of the country. But at many points they resisted and turned down the suggestions of the restless western spirit as unfit for the academic repose and the cultured setting of the eastern colleges and universities. It is well known how coeducation appears a matter of course in all colleges on the other side of the great educational divide and how separated education in the college halls has remained the ideal in the stretch from Boston to Washington.

The last years have brought another new western

experiment, which to-day can hardly be called an experiment any longer, as it has succeeded splendidly and hence has certainly come to stay in those regions where it was started. The question is whether it will spread beyond its original western birthplace and whether it will find an entrance into the conservative East, which as yet seems vehemently opposed to the proposed intrusion. This time the women students alone are concerned; it is therefore only a matter for the large leading women's colleges of the East whether they will finally resist or finally yield. The problem is the introduction of home economics or household sciences, or whatever we may prefer to call that new branch of studies, into the college curriculum. The source of the opposition is familiar. College education is to lead the mind of the young woman to all which is true and beautiful and noble, to a realm of ideals and inspiration, far removed from the sordidness of practical life with its commercial interests and its common technical pursuits. The college years are the one time in the woman's life career in which everything is to appeal to her purest and finest emotions and is to stimulate her highest mental energies. Have we a right to fill this time too with the trivial miseries of household care and turn the enthusiastic eye of the young woman from the Parthenon to the kitchen utensils and the sewing table? That may be all right for special commercial

schools and industrial pseudo-colleges; that may fit Simmons, but it would distort and injure Bryn Mawr.

This feeling of repugnance, which frequently has grown into indignation, is not a little strengthened by the knowledge of some of the motives which evidently have entered into this campaign of the state universities. Everybody knows that the farmers of the Middle West have more enthusiasm for good harvests and for reduction of the household expenses than for Greek literature or radioactivity. Their state legislature will accordingly be more easily cajoled into voting public money for the increasing expenditures of the state university when the practical instruction stands in the foreground and makes a showing which appeals to everyone in the crowd. Agriculture for the boys and domestic science for the girls fulfill this desire exactly. Hence the introduction of domestic science may be a clever political move in the budget game out there in the western state capitals, but such politics finds no place in the private institutions. Even if their trustees were to listen to such financial arguments, they would probably calculate that the number of students and accordingly the income will be the larger, the more firmly they uphold the cultural ideas of the surrounding eastern community. Yet fortunately they are anyhow independent of such practical speculations, and can ask straightway: what is the best for a college

student? Only on this ideal level ought the question to be answered everywhere: if the decision has to be that home economics is unbecoming for a true college and adverse to its ideal interests, the taxpayers and legislatures ought to be educated up to the better insight. But is such a negative decision really demanded by the true meaning of the college as a place of liberal culture? Is he who believes in domestic science as an organic part of a college education really disloyal to the highest ideals of the eastern traditions?

The detailed plan for such household courses is of course not uniform. In various universities the programme shows characteristic differences. Yet certain chief features seem to be repeated almost everywhere on a more or less imposing scale, with more or less elaboration and with richer or more modest equipment. Everywhere a large part of the college work in the department of household sciences naturally belongs to the study of food in its widest aspects. The chemical composition of food, its manufacture, its changes by heat or cold or fermentation, furthermore its physiological effect on the body, the bacteriological problems, the principles of diet, the relation of food to health, to age, to sex, to occupation, and finally its economic side, its selection, its preservation, its fullest utilization, the tests for food alterations, the pure food laws, are the chief topics. Many of them demand laboratory exer-

cises and practical investigations. Another large group which is prominent in all programmes refers to the house as such. There the interest turns on the one side to the architecture and sanitation, including the study of surroundings and construction, of soil, drainage, ventilation, heating, and extending to real house planning and to practice in making skeleton plans. On the other side it turns to the house decoration, with special reference to the æsthetic and historical aspect of furniture, to the color harmonies, to the discrimination of rugs, of wall papers and so forth. A third group deals with textiles, their manufacture, their selection, their microscopic and chemical analysis, the hygienic and æsthetic aspects of cloth, the physical and chemical problems of laundry work and many related questions. Finally we find everywhere a scholarly study of household management, in which the organization of the household, the expenditures of the family income, care of the house, principles of nursing, and similar domestic activities are considered. In some universities we also find courses in sewing and dress-making with practical exercises. In others special emphasis is laid on medical nursing. Again other institutions offer courses in "humanics" in which the center lies in the problem of the child and his development from infancy to adolescence.

How does such a programme fit into the general

plan of college work, if we interpret the meaning of college education in that conservative spirit which prevails in the East? Of course there is a possible view of university purposes for which such a traditional "cultural" intention excites only ridicule. The university, the opponents say, is the place at which everybody ought to have a chance to learn everything which has any importance for him; it ought to be the great department store for knowledge in which you may find everything which men know and learn; and as many a boy or girl prefers to learn typewriting or metal cutting or to study about farms or the stock market to the reading of Sanskrit or the interpreting of Milton, let us by all means have the useful, practical, study courses on our warehouse counters. For one who takes such a view no problem and no question is here involved. To know how to manage the household, how to buy food and how to select the wall papers is a useful acquirement, and if it can be learned, surely the college must give the opportunity. But the authorities of the best eastern universities would not only object to such a view; they would consider it as a prostitution of their ideals. The college, they would claim, is not to offer to everybody everything, but only to the well-prepared ones that which will help them toward a fuller development of their inner life and which will prepare them to build up their vocational or avocational later life on a

broader and firmer foundation. The much misused word culture after all signifies the meaning better than any other; it emphasizes that all strictly technical and practical teaching, however important it may be, does not belong there. The lawyer, the physician, the engineer, would never seek his professional training in the undergraduate college course; the technical and professional instruction of the less complex type like that of the household may in the same way be relegated to special institutions, but must not be allowed to trespass upon the academic yard.

This tendency against professionalization in the college period is indeed not weakening in the East, but rather growing stronger. We may consider as typical the changes in Harvard College which for many years was most progressive in the direction of perfectly free election of college courses. Certainly the courses offered were only those of cultural value, but among them every student had complete liberty to take or not to take what he pleased, and that after all meant a certain concession to the professional spirit. The student would naturally be under a temptation to select only such courses as stood in a definite relation to his later specialized life work: the future physician cannot pursue medical courses in his undergraduate years, but he felt inclined to take exclusively courses in the natural sciences which helped him toward his later studies in

the medical school and he neglected his opportunity to broaden his mind by humanistic interests. This indirect help toward onesided professionalism has recently been exterminated even in Harvard; the practice of many years was changed two years ago into an educational policy which insists on a certain breadth of studies. The courses are divided into four large groups and every student has to choose some work in every one; he cannot go toward graduation with natural science only, but must also have some studies in history, in languages and so on. If in this way even the leader in the movement for free election has yielded, it may be acknowledged that the unprofessional character of the college is to be upheld for the near future. But does this really exclude the household sciences?

Of course we abstract from the work of that small minority of students who devote themselves to the domestic studies in order to use them for a professional life career. Several such careers stand open. Some wish to teach home economics in the secondary schools or in commercial institutions; some plan to devote themselves to vocational work as dietitians or as sanitary inspectors or as managers of food laboratories or as designers in commercial industries, or as interior decorators and so on; some finally, intend to carry out scientific research in home economics in the service of biology

or of political economy. All this is important, but it does not directly concern the college question. If this group of students alone were involved, it would be wiser to hand it all over to special technical schools or to the graduate departments of the universities. Some of the state universities indeed have advanced courses for such future specialists in their graduate schools, seminary courses in research or courses on the teaching of home economics and similar professional instruction. Wherever domestic sciences are taught in college, these specialists may partake in them in order to go further on in the field, but their interest has no right to decide whether such studies are fitted for college. Our introductory undergraduate work ought always to steer clear of overtender respect for later professional specialists, as otherwise the rights of the overwhelming majority become neglected. I am lecturing on psychology in Harvard this year before four hundred and twenty undergraduates who have selected my course, but I hope that surely no more than a score will become psychologists for life and will be concerned with psychology ten years hence; the course belongs therefore by right to the four hundred other men who take it for their cultural growth and expression. Nobody doubts that the study of psychology or philosophy or literature or history or physics can have this cultural significance;

the problem is whether we have the right to claim such a value for home economics.

By all means let us not forget that cultural does not mean or in the least suggest that a study ought to be practically useless. It is true that some opponents of the traditional college have delighted in picturing the usual college studies as merely ornamental fancies as if the students were trained there in a kind of intellectual calisthenics. That is nothing but a caricature. Not mental dancing but mental athletics are taught in college, and that brings to the youth a gain in mental strength and power useful and helpful for every effort in practical life. But even in a more technical sense the applicability of a study does not contradict its fitness for the college curriculum. As I said, nobody doubts that I am giving a cultural course when I am teaching my class in psychology, and yet a considerable part of that work is devoted to problems of practical application. We consider carefully in what way the facts of psychology may be made serviceable to school education or to the needs of the courtroom or to vocational guidance or to psychotherapy, and I confidently hope that many of my students when they go out into the world as teachers or lawyers or physicians or business men will find their psychological studies useful in their daily life and helpful for the solution of many

very practical problems. It is certainly no different with studies in economics and government or in physics, chemistry, biology, mathematics, geography, and nobody who devotes much of his college time to cultural studies in modern foreign languages and literatures will disregard the practical advantage of his proficiency in understanding the language for actual usage. Within these reasonable limits the usefulness of the courses not only does not contradict the demand for culture, but is directly demanded by it and harmonizes perfectly with it. The college time is certainly not to detach anyone from the great world which awaits him with its serious demands. It is not by chance that the new Harvard plan while it forbids a professional onesidedness at the same time insists that a certain large part of the chosen courses be clustered in one particular field; a mere nibbling of all kinds of studies is no preparation for the earnest tasks of life: the concentration of studies is early to point to a unified aim in the future. The college bred youth is never to be severed from the practical world by his culture courses, but to be brought to a point of outlook from which that practical world is understood in its truer connections and deeper meaning. The mere fact that the studies in home economics will be useful to a girl whether she marry or not, and that they will later on help her in her problems of the day, is therefore not the least objection to their cultural

standing, provided that such culture value exists at all.

But after all what is the test for this value? We have already pointed to the most essential criterion as far as the subject matter of a special study is concerned. Any study is a fit part of general higher education, if it contributes to an understanding of life and the world in their inner connections. To see nothing in isolation, but everything in its relations to causes and effects, to purposes and developments, to see, in short, everything against the background of the natural laws and of the history of civilization: this characterizes the truly educated, as it makes him able to see foreground and background in their true proportions. Not everybody can, or ought to, understand everything, as no one comes in contact with every feature of the social and natural world. But at least that fraction of the world in which our individual life is embedded, the history of our institutions and national life, of our art and literature and language, the principles of the nature which surrounds us and of our technical agencies, of our mind and our body, of our social aims and ideals, ought to be brought within reach of everyone who seeks the highest level of cultural education. Beyond that point the professional detail begins, which may interest the lawyer but not the engineer, or vice versa, but all this refers to the world which is common to all in our national circle. Yet, even in this circle, there is some

differentiation, or at least some shading. The facts of government and politics and certain aspects of economics belong essentially to the world in which the average man has to work out his daily life; they are surely not foreign to women's experiences, yet they are secondary for her activity. If she studies them in a thorough way, it takes a kind of professional character; it is not an essential part of her cultural education. Correspondingly the problems of the house and the household, of food and clothing are organic parts of the world in which the average woman in our social organization has to work out her destiny. Man is in contact with them, but they are secondary for his achievements; hence if he were to study them, it would be professional, not cultural interest. For the woman, however, nothing can be a truer part of cultural education, if culture really means the ability to see the offerings and questions of our particular world not isolated, detached, accidental, but against the background of law and development.

To use the telephone and to send a wireless message without understanding of the principles of electricity, or to talk party politics without knowledge of American history, is typical of the uncultured; is it less uncultured to be in practical contact with shelter, food and clothing and yet to be unaware of the relations in which every single piece stands to a world of past and present

and future facts? No bit of furniture stands in our room of which every detail does not possess a long and complex history, often reflecting the whole history of human progress. Every form and curve of the chair and the table, every design in the wall paper and the rug, every variation of the bed or the mirror, of the spoon or the glass, is a part of a fascinating story of development. But besides the historical aspect the æsthetic viewpoint demands its right. Every piece then becomes an organic part of a harmonious whole in which the life totality of a worthy personality is expressed. Every patch of color, every ornament, every characteristic form of the smallest piece as well as of the largest becomes suggestive and significant in this wider æsthetic setting. And finally each piece is made from material which nature supplied and which industry has shaped; each is thus linked with knowledge of the natural substances which biology and chemistry describe and with the knowledge of the industrial processes. Accordingly the tray or the vase or the picture frame, the rocking chair or the piano or the little rug in our room are accidental and meaningless as long as we take them disconnectedly. But as soon as we have acquired the necessary deeper knowledge, each of them leads us to the whole of social history, to the structure and laws of nature, to the processes of human industry and to the demands of æsthetics and indirectly of mo-

rality. Each apparently insignificant object becomes a center of crystallization for most manifold interests; a richness of relations is now understood which is dead to the unprepared, and this is the test and the meaning of culture. Exactly the same is of course true of food or clothing or shelter. In the case of food the historical and æsthetic relations exist but become less essential; in their place we have the very important connections with health and disease, with the bodily functions related to occupational work, to sex and age; on the other hand the conditions of their production, the relations to the kingdoms of animals and plants and to the physical and chemical processes in the kitchen, and finally their complex relations to the national economy, to the conditions of the world market and to the social principles of home economy. In short the cup of tea at the breakfast table may to the naïve mind be just tea in a cup, and that is all. To the trained mind both the cup and the tea are the crossing points of thousandfold interests. The cup connects itself with the history of the forms of pottery through thousands of years, it links itself with the chemistry of porcelain, it evokes a world of æsthetic considerations. At the same time the tea becomes related to the natural history of the tea plant, to the technical processes and to the economic conditions which lead to its appearance on the market, to the physics of its preparation, to its

effect on the nervous system, to its value in the whole scheme of nourishment. Nor will the cup of tea be any less tempting, because a background of culture has set it into a world of significant connections. A woman cannot take a nobler power from her college life into the turmoil of the world than the gift of seeing every element of the home in this wider perspective, that is of substituting the cultural aspect for the trivial one.

The necessary consequence, to be sure, is that instruction in home economics belongs in a college only if it is really given for this purpose of widening the perspective and interpreting the single fact by its relation to the whole social, historical, naturalistic and æsthetic background. As soon as the teaching of domestic sciences sticks to the accidental facts and refers only to the external technique, its place is in a technical household school and not in the college. A practical course in cooking or sewing is certainly a useful and important exercise for many girls, but to introduce it into the college world means indeed to give up the true college ideal. The state university which announces a course in which "a heavy skirt and a single-lined dress is made" and another course in which "a suit of underwear is sewed" and "attention is paid to the mending of clothing" cannot possibly be an example for eastern colleges. But most of the state universi-

ties keep away from such concessions to the desire for mere technical skill. The colleges do not teach piano practice either, although they provide courses in the history and theory of music. The college is no place to learn cooking and mending, but what the true studies in domestic sciences offer, with their wealth of historical, sociological, biological, chemical, æsthetic and economical information, is endlessly better and it ought not to be missed in any women's college which aims toward real culture.

The effect would in the first place be practical. Where an immense waste of means, of strength, of time, of health, has been going on, a well-planned adjustment to the economic and biological conditions would begin. It is claimed that nearly ten billion dollars are spent annually in the United States by women for household maintenance; yet it is spent without that deeper knowledge of the material, its sources, its effects, its characteristics, which would be demanded in any other large economic transactions. Not only the budget but the bodily health of the family and through it the whole nation must suffer. The waste of national resources through the public recklessness toward the forests and the mines has finally aroused the conscience of the whole land; the economic waste in the families through woman's lack of deeper understanding of household sciences is still more appalling.

But the practical good will be accompanied by ideal gains. The gain in home happiness resulting from better health and greater savings, must follow immediately. But besides it no one can overestimate the gain through the æsthetic pleasures which may be hoped for. There is no denying that the overwhelming mass of American homes, rich or poor alike, show little taste, endlessly less than the female inhabitants of the house demonstrate in their dresses. The dress of the home cannot be bought completed from the tailor who is after all a specialist; the dress of the home results from the work of those who live in it and their culture becomes decisive. It is an easy thing to pick up a vase or a chair on a bargain counter, but it needs a firm cultural background to determine whether they will contribute to a noble harmonious whole or whether they will be in disharmony with the æsthetic spirit of the room for which they are planned. The American nation, strong in its ethical instincts, is in the midst of acquiring æsthetic feelings, and they must slowly grow by irradiating from the home. Only when the house, the room, the meal, are attractive and beautiful, will the spirit of beauty reach out to the whole town and surroundings. Yet the ideal gain lies still in another direction. The household work and the householder alike suffer from the depressing idea that the work of the housekeeper is drudgery. It is well known that

this is the chief source for much of the dissatisfaction and restlessness in the world of women. Now the truth is that every human being's life work is in its largest part drudgery, if the elements of the work are taken isolated and detached, and they become interesting and inspiring if they are viewed in their deeper relations. As soon as you analyze the doctor's or the lawyer's or the teacher's or the manufacturer's work, each little part in itself seems trivial, unimportant, accidental and therefore tiresome and hardly worth while, but as soon as the wider connections are understood, even the smallest becomes significant. A woman who sees the detail of her home work in the light of broad knowledge no longer knows it as drudgery; every little piece in the household bristles with interests, every activity of hers is linked with all mankind, æsthetic and moral, hygienic and economic problems of highest importance suddenly seem involved in apparently little matters, the whole surroundings become luminous and wonderful. It would be more than can be hoped if the blessing of such cultural knowledge would fill the heart of every good woman in the land, but it ought at least not to be withheld from those fortunate ones who can devote four of their best years to their highest education on the college grounds.

THE GERMANS AT SCHOOL

*This essay first appeared in the Popular Science
Monthly*

THE GERMANS AT SCHOOL

AT the time of their political weakness the Germans were derisively called the thinkers and dreamers. When the other great nations divided the world of reality among themselves, the Germans took refuge in the realm of fancy. The stronger peoples considered them as the members of a rich household look on the poor schoolmaster at their table. That time has passed away. The politics and commerce and industry of Germany have secured its powerful position in the world, and no one doubts the strength of the Germans in the field of the real facts. But there was mingled with the derisive mood of previous times a silent respect for that German idealism. The name of thinkers and dreamers appeared to some, and not to the worst, a title of honor. The world acknowledged that in scholarship and research and education the Germans were able to teach mankind. Their schools were models and their methods superior, and in the days of war the world accepted the saying that the German schoolmaster had won the battles. How much of this honor and glory has been left in these times of German

commercial, industrial and political advance? Has the forward striving in the realm of might and power meant loss of prestige, and, what is more important, loss of true achievement in the field of thought and education, or did the progress of modern Germany involve as much intellectual gain as practical profit? The Germans at work easily win the admiration of every visitor who goes to their centers of industry. Are the Germans at school equally deserving of honorable praise, or are they simply resting on their laurels?

The educational life of a country is always a great organism in which all parts are interdependent. There cannot be good schools without good universities, nor good universities without good schools. The quality of the teachers and the quality of the pupils, the general education and the special instruction are all intimately related to one another. We must look into this organic system if we want to ascertain its strength and endurance. A few educational show pieces are not enough. Is there progress and growth in all the essential parts? We may begin with the German university, which is, after all, the real heart of the whole organism and which had more direct influence on American educational life than any other part of the German educational system. Those who built up the great American institutions in the last generation from mere colleges into true universities had received the

decisive impulses in German academic halls. To be sure in recent years a kind of reaction has set in in America. The tradition that German university work represents the highest standards of scholarship has recently been roughly handled by skeptics. Some have claimed that German university research is too specialistic and on that account too narrow. The German scholars lack the wide perspective which has been characteristic of so much of the best English work. Others insist that the structure of the German publications is formless. They long for the French polish and clearness. Some blame the German professors for a certain remoteness from life and feel that American scholarship will abolish this kind of "scholarship for scholars" and will again unite science and life.

It was inevitable that such a reaction should occur. The young generation of American instructors found a situation entirely different from that which their teachers had found some decades before. Great American universities had been built up in the meantime and had created a new spirit of scholarly independence which naturally took the turn of a slight opposition to the former masters. But such reactions are only passing moods. Those who know German scholarship to-day have no doubt that all these accusations never have had less justice than at present. Certainly German scholarship is specialistic, and there will

never be any true scholarship which is not founded on specialistic work. Any thorough research must be specialistic, and research without thoroughness can never secure lasting results. But the work of the great German naturalists and historians has shown at all times the tendency to wide generalizations, and the present day perhaps more than the last half century is again filled with broad philosophical endeavor. Still more unfair is the often repeated cry against the formlessness of German scholarship. Not every doctor's thesis can be a thing of beauty, but perhaps there has never been a time in which the German language has been so shaped by æsthetic ideals. The German bookbinders were for a long while notorious for tasteless covers, but the general opinion in recent international exhibitions has been that now no country makes more beautiful bindings than Germany. This artistic improvement of the book is not confined to the cover. The content of the German book shows a literary finish in structure and style which ought not to be overlooked. Finally, as to the aloofness of German scholarship, the triumphs of modern German technique and medical therapy speak loudly enough of the comradeship between science and life. And how could it be otherwise in a country which has become so money-hunting and practical? The best proof of the injustice of such accusations and attacks lies in the number of American

students who still feel attracted by the German academic atmosphere in spite of the wonderful development of American higher institutions of learning.

Winter before last there were three hundred American students in German universities, and it must not be forgotten that these young men and women are not undergraduate college students, but that the German university welcomes them only if they can show their college diploma. The German semesters correspond to the study in the postgraduate departments of the American universities. As Director of the Amerika-Institut, I wrote to these three hundred delegates of the new world and asked them with what training they came and for what purpose, whether they felt satisfied or whether they found anything of which to complain, what they were doing and what they were intending to do, and what they could suggest. The answers display an interesting variety. The young American scholars came from all parts of the country and their favorite spots in Germany are Berlin, Leipzig, Munich, Heidelberg and Göttingen. In their studies naturally the German language and German literature take the lead, but philosophy, history, political economy and, in the line of science, chemistry and medicine stand next. Mathematics is also often chosen, and, on the whole, there is no corner in the field of learning to which some Americans are not turning. Lowest in the list is the

study of law, which of course is best pursued in one's own country. As to their aims and reasons for coming to Germany, some, to be sure, had no deeper argument than that they "had a fellowship," and some that there "is no special reason." Some wanted to see a foreign civilization at first-hand in order to be able to judge more correctly of their own, or to study German in order to teach it in America. But the overwhelming majority insisted that there was still superior opportunity for their special branches in German institutions and that the most thorough and deepest preparation could still be gained on German soil. The two fundamental tones of the replies were given by the one who wrote: "I came to train myself to think independently," and by the other who wrote: "The best that was offered me in the American lecture room, library and seminary was the fruit directly or indirectly of German research. I wished to come into intimate contact with it." As to their satisfaction with the results, praise and complaint were intermingled. Many asserted that they were entirely satisfied, not a few expressing themselves in terms of enthusiasm. Some limited their approval to certain sides: "Very well satisfied with intellectual side of the university, but have not received much help religiously." Others miss the American sports or the social life among students. Many are dissatisfied with the lack of personal contact with pro-

fessors. Again some complain that the student finds no oversight and is not called to account and that accordingly too much loafing is possible. Some complain that the attendants do not understand English or that the libraries do not give out the books quickly enough. Some suggest more opportunities for learning the language, others demand the removal of evil social influences and student drunkenness. But there is an almost surprising unity in the instinctive acknowledgment of the admirable methods of research and of highly advanced instruction. This cordial appreciation by those who stand in the midst of the German influences corresponds to the judgment of all who see German academic life with impartial eyes. There is an intensity in the search for truth and an eagerness for the development of the best scholarly methods which is still unsurpassed in the world.

The weaknesses of the German university are not few. To those who come from American traditions the most regrettable difference is the lack of interest in the student's life. The student is practically left to himself. This is true as to his social life and true as to his studies. No one supervises him, no one cares whether he is industrious or lazy, and the result is that many a weak man comes to grief who might have succeeded with the help and control of the American system. But these defects of the German university as educa-

tional institutions are the necessary counterparts of their excellence as places of independent scholarship. The highest goal of intellectual achievement will always be reached only in complete freedom, and this freedom is somewhat dangerous for the weak man. There can be no doubt that the German system is indeed much more adjusted to those above the average than to those below, and the opposite is true of the American system. But it is not only the lack of personal help and the demand for his own activity which is in contrast with the American ample provisions for intellectual support. Even the choice of the teachers differs in the same direction. The American instructor is appointed, above all, because he is a good teacher; the German because he is an important contributor to the advancement of knowledge. He may be and not seldom is a poor teacher. Yet the German university ideal suggests that the true student will profit more from the contact with a man who has mastered the method of research than from any inferior scholar, however effective he may be as a teacher.

The Germans themselves are far from considering their universities perfect. Intense reforms are reshaping the entire university life, but it is characteristic that no so-called reform propositions are taking hold which limit in any way the freedom of study. The Germans do not want more examinations by which the

student becomes more or less a school pupil, although they believe in thorough discipline and supervision even in the highest classes of the Gymnasium, which corresponds to the average American college. The most wholesome change in the student life is the quiet but steady repression of the vulgar beer-drinking habits with all the noisy accessories. The entire student life has become cleaner and more modern. The old traditions had come from a time when the young academic scholar wanted to emphasize the contrast between his eager life and the dullness of the philistine crowd. But modern times have changed this contrast by bringing life and interest and political activity into those crowds and the student has thus lost his right to live a life entirely different from that of his social surroundings. The rush of young Germany toward the university is still steadily increasing. There are about 63,000 students in the twenty-one high seats of learning, 12,000 in the law schools, 12,000 in the medical schools, about 4,000 students of divinity and the remainder in the so-called philosophical faculty which corresponds to the American graduate school. It is characteristic that the chief increase has come to the universities in the large cities in which the old-fashioned student life has always played a small rôle. In Berlin there are 14,000 persons attending the lectures and in Munich 7,000, in Leipzig 6,000. Yet espe-

cially those universities in small towns which are famous for the beauty of landscape have had their proportionate growth. In lovely Freiburg in Baden the one thousandth student was welcomed with a celebration at the time when I came there as a young instructor. Recently they have celebrated the coming of the three thousandth student. The rapid growth of the academic communities strongly suggests the foundation of new universities. Münster in Westphalia grew into a fullfledged university only a few years ago, Frankfort-on-Main has just succeeded in its enthusiastic fight for the development of its academy into a university. The Prussian Diet seriously objected to this ambition of the citizens of Frankfort, as it feared that the smaller universities in the neighborhood would be the sufferers, but the university of Frankfort is now a reality. The same may be expected of the university of Hamburg, which so far consists of a number of interrelated institutes. But while the universities are growing in number and branching off in new and ever new specialties, they are also being supplemented by new forms of scholarly activity. The most characteristic new feature which gains increasing importance is the erection of research institutes, especially in the field of natural science and medicine. There investigations can be carried on without any reference to instruction, the scholars are dis-

burdened from every educational responsibility, and the progress of knowledge becomes the only goal. At the same time the number of technical schools on the level of the universities has been increased to twelve, since those of Danzig and Breslau have recently come into existence, and Germany's famous mining schools, forest schools, agricultural schools and veterinary schools show the same signs of flourishing life.

The greatest change, however, in the academic life of the nation has come through the new regulations which link the university with the schools. The American schools have usually left a certain freedom in the choice of studies within a single institution. In the same high school the boy can take a classical course or a more realistic course. Germany has always had separate schools for the different schemes of preparation. The higher schools which engaged the boys to the nineteenth or twentieth year have always been of three types, the Gymnasium which puts the chief emphasis on Latin and Greek, the Realgymnasium which omits the Greek and emphasizes modern languages and the Oberrealschule which has very little Latin but much natural science. They correspond roughly to the American high school and a modest American college or the first two or three years of the best colleges. The tradition allowed only those who had the certificate of the Gymnasium to take up the study of law,

medicine, divinity and philology. The university study of natural sciences and of modern languages besides a number of practical callings were the only goals accessible to those who came from the other two types of schools. Long struggles which excited all Germany led to the abolition of this monopoly by classical education. With the year 1902 the great modern school reform began and every year has brought new advance. To-day practically every boy who has passed through a school of any one of the three types finds the doors of the university wide open, whatever profession he may choose. It may be too early to judge whether only advantages will follow in the train of this reform. There are not a few who are afraid that the realistic schooling of the future lawyers and government officers may be a danger to the idealistic character of the national life, and there are many who believe that even the physician needs to read his Plato in school time more than to begin at once with the chemical laboratory. But in any case the great change has brought fresh air into the academic halls. The second great change was the full admission of women. For a long time they had the permission to attend lectures but no academic rights equal to those of men could be acknowledged for the women students until they should bring to the entrance door of the university the same certificate as the boys were expected to bring from their

schools. The real advance of the women in the university sphere depended upon the establishment of girls' schools which would lead to exactly the same goal as the Gymnasium for boys. This was at last accomplished by the splendid organization of girls' instruction of three years ago.

Prussia has now four types of higher schools for girls, each of which may be divided into various independent departments. In the center stands the upper girls' school, a somewhat revised edition of the traditional German school for girls. There are ten classes which are usually passed through in the period from the sixth to the sixteenth year. The first three classes are preparatory, with eight to ten hours a week instruction in the mother tongue, three hours arithmetic every week, two to three hours writing, two hours needle-work, three hours of religion, which is an organic part of every German school, two half hours of singing, two half hours of gymnastics and some drawing as well. In the seven upper classes the German language takes six, five and finally four hours a week, and French exactly the same number, altogether thirty-two hours each in those seven years. English is taught in the four upper classes only four hours a week, mathematics three hours a week throughout, geography two hours through the seven years, natural history two hours, religion two hours, drawing two hours, singing two hours, gymnastics

two hours, needlework two hours, but this is no longer obligatory in the four upper classes. Those who have passed through this ten years' course may enter either the so-called Frauenschule or the Seminary or the Studienanstalt. The first is planned to complete the education of a young woman who seeks a higher training without any professional aim. It is adjusted to the needs of women who are to play an intelligent rôle, not only in the home, but also in social life. It is in no way a finishing school for one who aims to shine in society, but meant for those who really want to serve. It is usually a course of two years in which pedagogy, household economy, kindergarten work, hygiene, political economy, civics, bookkeeping and needlework stand in the foreground, while modern languages, history, literature, natural science, art, drawing and music are relegated to the position of minor electives.

The Seminary, on the other hand, is meant for those who aim to become teachers of the lower schools. It demands three years' scholarly work and one year of practical training in schools. In those three years of theoretical study, French, English and mathematics take four hours a week each year, German, natural science and religion three hours a week, pedagogy, history and geography two hours. In their fourth year, the practical term, the candidates study pedagogy and methods of teaching seven hours, eight hours a week

thesis writing, six hours training in practical class work and six hours training in the practical methods of the various subjects, including laboratory experiments. In addition to all this, through the four years there are three hours of gymnastics, two hours of drawing and one hour of singing. For the friends of women's progress, however, the chief accent of the system lies on the Studienanstalt. It is a school of six classes demanding six years' work open to those who have passed the first seven classes of the higher girls' schools. The three highest classes of the girls' school are then skipped, and instead of them the six years' course undertaken. This, however, is again divided into three separate schools corresponding to the Gymnasium, the Realgymnasium and the Oberrealschule of the boys. In the Gymnasium course during those six years the girls have three hours a week German, six hours a week Latin, at first three, later two hours French, in the first two classes three hours a week English, in the last four classes eight hours a week Greek. Through all the years there is history two hours, mathematics first four, later two hours, religion two, geography one, gymnastics three and drawing three. In the Realgymnasium the girls have no Greek whatever, but throughout six hours Latin, three hours French, three hours English and somewhat more mathematics and natural science than in the Gymnasium course. Finally in the Ober-

realschule Latin too is omitted while both French and English are increased to four hours a week, mathematics to five, natural science to four and German also to four. This new plan adapts itself most successfully to the various needs, and the only danger lies in the fact that inasmuch as these three last types of schools open wide the way to the professional studies of the universities the number of academically trained women may soon by far surpass the demand of the community.

This vivid activity in the direction of liberal changes through governmental initiative does not exclude an abundance of efforts to break new educational paths. For instance much interest is centered nowadays on the so-called reform schools. They aim toward postponing the decision for a particular type of school as late as possible. The usual schools are different from the start. The classical schools begin with their Latin in the lowest classes. The reform school systems, of which the model was the city school system of Frankfort, have a common foundation for all schools, reminding one in this respect of the American principle. The much discussed Frankfort plan in the first three classes gives to all the pupils in common five hours German, six hours French, two hours geography, five hours mathematics, two hours of natural science, two hours of writing, three to two hours of religion, three hours of gymnastics, two hours of drawing and two hours of

singing. Only with the fourth class does the bifurcation begin. In the classical course the fourth class begins at once with ten hours Latin and the sixth class with eight hours of Greek, while in the realistic course the Latin is started in the fourth class, with eight hours going down to six, and the English begins in the sixth class with six hours. There is still much distrust of this apparently very reasonable procedure. Everyone feels that the momentous decision of the character of the education ought to be made at an age when the individual differences show more clearly than in the first years of school life, but the friends of the traditional Gymnasium are still convinced that a thorough classical training in accordance with the old German ideals ought to shape the mind of the youth in the characteristic way from a tender age. There the German school men still stand in the midst of passionate discussions.

But the intense pedagogical forward movement of the German people must not be studied only in the programmes of the official schools. After all they represent the conservative aspect. The most progressive changes which would upset the traditions altogether are expressed in private institutions, usually the creations of enthusiastic idealists. They feel that there is a deep-lying antagonism between the claims of the official school and hundreds of thousands of hopes. Un-

doubtedly a large part of the nation is convinced that the whole school system is antiquated and too little adjusted to the needs of the new Germany. The schools still carry with them too much of that Germany which lived and thought but which was politically powerless and in the practical world helpless. The new German who does not look into the clouds but prefers to stand with both feet firm on the ground wants knowledge of natural science instead of languages, wants development toward national patriotism instead of religion in school, and wants civics instead of archeology. The center of it all is the firm demand that the youth be prepared for the national life with its social demands and its realistic energies. The character is to be developed still more than the intellect, and the mind is to be schooled for a time which overstrains a man unless he is trained for concentration. Of course much superficiality and pedagogical amateurishness are in play there. Especially the educational value of the natural sciences is still a very doubtful claim in the eyes of those who have really watched the outcome. But in this point too the serious reformers propose a fundamental change. They say that natural sciences are indeed without fundamental significance for the mind of the youth if the instruction means only a heaping up of information. In these days of rapid naturalistic progress the temptation is always great to bring the

boy in contact with as many fields of positive knowledge as possible. But there is too much kaleidoscopic unrest in this superficial excitement of the intellect to bring any lasting gain. The new leaders therefore wish that knowledge be considered as unimportant and that the mastery of method and of naturalistic thinking alone be emphasized. The boys are to learn how to learn from nature. And in a corresponding way these groups of reformers wish to change the teaching of history. The children are not to learn the facts but the methods to find out the true facts from various sources. They are to be brought into contact with the old reports by which the events of the past are transmitted. The knowledge of the languages ought to be gained by practice in conversation, the knowledge of the earth by wandering and living in nature.

This is typically combined in the much-admired institutions of Dr. Lietz, the so-called Landerziehungsheime, educational homes in the country. Lietz is a young enthusiastic teacher who was stirred by the ideal of building up healthy, strong, joyful, energetic and judicial men who would be in sympathy with their fellow creatures and understand the needs of the common people, and yet who would be inspired by art and science and technique. He has created in the loveliest regions of Germany three national schools, for the youngest children between seven and twelve in Ilsen-

burg in the Hartz, the second in Haubinda in Thuringia for the boys between twelve and fifteen and the third in the castle of Bieberstein in the Rhön Mountains for boys between sixteen and twenty. All three places are far removed from the turmoil of the world, and the boys find there a most harmonious interconnection of intellectual training, handicraft work, agricultural activity, sport and inspiring social intercourse between teachers and pupils. It is a delight to see those happy youngsters under conditions in which their natural instincts for out-of-door life and for social companionship, for manual activity and for sport, are so wholesomely satisfied and at the same time where their intellectual development is secured by individualizing training in scholarly method. They learn really to love the literature and the history of their country and to become personally interested in the political and the economic structure of their nation. Their minds are opened to music and art, to religion and morality. Small groups of them undertake walking trips not only into the near neighborhood, but to far-distant parts of the fatherland in a simple camping style. Sometimes even long journeys to Egypt and elsewhere have been undertaken in the vacation time. Truly it is an ideal method to develop a healthy mind in a healthy body. Whether it will become the crystallization point for general educational changes in Germany is, however, more than

doubtful. So far these reforms are in an uphill fight. They suffer from that which they feel as an unfairness, namely, from the fact that their schools must lead the boys to the same examinations which the regular school boys have to pass if the pupils are to go on to the university or to any other official career. This demands that in the last years much cramming be introduced and that features be forced on these new boy parades which seem very foreign to their spirit. They demand, accordingly, new regulations which will give to the new types of schools more appropriate examinations as end points. As long as this is not granted, these schools remain confined to narrow circles. But more important perhaps is the second fact. The Germans feel on the whole very unwilling to give their sons and daughters out of the house, if the education can possibly be obtained in the neighborhood. The system of the American academies and boarding schools is contrary to all German traditions. Especially in the large cities in which the Americans are most readily inclined to send their children away for the educational years, the Germans would least think of separating the youth from the home.

It may seem surprising to American observers that in the abundance of educational schemes which recent times have ripened in Germany nowhere has a serious movement toward coeducation been started. In a very

modest way it has been forced on the communities in those places in which girls want to be prepared for the university but where no special Gymnasium classes for girls have been arranged. Just these exceptional cases however hasten the establishment of special Gymnasiums for women. The German community is decidedly unwilling to gather in one schoolroom boys and girls beyond the age of the elementary school. They do not object to the coeducational instruction of small children in rural schools. This is a frequent practice. Nor do they object to the comradeship of young men and women on the level of the highest university work. But in the broad period of the development of adolescence they believe in strict bieducation. Even when the material of study is the same, differentiation of method is demanded and German pedagogues decidedly object to women teachers for grown-up boys. The fact is that the new girls' school plans, even where they lead to exactly the same goal as the Gymnasium or the Realschule, distribute the material in a characteristically different way from the programme of the boys' schools. They acknowledge the psychological laws of the different rhythm of the development of the two sexes. The well-known suggestion that the boys become refined and the girls strengthened through the presence of the other sex is the more powerless, since the educators feel justified in reporting that even America, where the ex-

periment has been tried most extensively, is in a stage of reaction against the coeducational enthusiasm.

Whoever looks at the free play of educational energies in Germany's social organism is probably most impressed by the strong activity outside of the regular day schools. Instruction for those who go to school because they have not yet entered a practical life work is furnished everywhere in the world, but no country shows such systematic educational planning for those who have left school and are at work in business or in factories, in agriculture or in any other calling. The splendid development which this type of pedagogical influence has found in recent times has been to a high degree due to a reaction against grave misuses in the past. In early times, to be sure, the boy who left the primary school was under the strict control of the master in the workshop or in the business. But the nineteenth century changed those paternalizing conditions and brought complete freedom. The result was a steadily growing insubordination and obstinacy, frivolous breaches of contracts and unreliability, together with a craving for enjoyment on the moral side, and a lack of careful training on the professional side. The community felt this inability to get hold of the boys who had left school as one of the most serious national dangers. In response to this need the continuation schools were founded which are to develop the youth after the

school years in moral, practical and intellectual respects. The essential difference from all other schools lies of course in the fact that these take only a fraction of the boy's time in order not to interfere with his work. But they receive their real social background from the legal obligation of the employer to give every boy the opportunity to attend these school classes. Compared with the general elementary school, the continuation school is professional, while the other is a humanistic school. On the other hand, compared with the real technical schools both lower and higher, it combines the technical instruction with general education. But, above all, the technical schools demand for some years the whole working time of the pupils, while the continuation schools are only supplementary to the chief business of the boy. The technical schools, such as for instance all the agricultural schools or the special industrial schools or the commercial schools, are strictly professional; the continuation schools are essentially educational. It may be said that even the technical element in them becomes subordinated to the aim of making a whole man and not only a skillful worker out of the boy who has left the school in his fourteenth year. The principle of this continuation school has conquered all Germany, but the realization of it looks very different in the various parts of the country. In some, the communities are forced by law to establish

such schools, in other parts the towns are free to arrange them according to the local needs. On the whole this difference seems less important, as the continuation schools are flourishing wonderfully in some parts in which the laws give large freedom in the matter to the community. The point about which the discussion at present seems much more excited is the question whether the schoolteacher or the man of practical life, the master in the arts and crafts, the business man, the farmer, the industrial specialist, is to be the decisive factor. The men of the workshop complain that these schools become worthless as soon as the methods and the points of view of the schoolteacher control them, and the opposite party believes that the highest value is missed if the spirit of the factory and not that of the schoolroom enters into them.

As the continuation schools were to serve the needs of young people in many different walks of practical life, the schools themselves had to develop an almost unlimited manifoldness. A subtle adjustment to the local conditions as well as to the varieties of industry and trade had to be aimed at. Continuation schools for candy makers and continuation schools for shoe makers had to be different. There are five chief types: the general continuation school, the commercial, the industrial, the rural and, exclusively for girls, the household economy school. Each of these types is realized

sometimes in schools of obligatory character, and sometimes in schools where the attendance is voluntary, as well as in schools with prescribed courses, and in others with great freedom of election. The most famous system of continuation schools, the discussion of which has had most valuable influence on the whole German situation, is that of the city of Munich, where the indefatigable superintendent of schools, Dr. Kerschensteiner, has succeeded in a perfect adjustment of educational needs to the practical requirements of the community. Particularly his industrial continuation schools have been organized in such a way that almost every important business is represented by special classes for apprentices and special classes for journeymen and older working men. There are classes for chimney sweepers and for cabinetmakers, for coachmen and for ivory carvers, for watchmakers and for photographers, for tailors and for locksmiths, for barbers and for gardeners, for office boys and for waiters. There are altogether two hundred and ninety-six classes for the first years and one hundred and thirteen classes for those who are beyond the years of apprenticeship. About ten thousand boys are regularly attending. Every class has a careful programme in which elements of general human education, elements of technical theoretical information and technical practical training, and finally elements of civic and sociological instruction, are har-

moniously combined. This blending of different factors shows itself in the appointment of teachers. In the two hundred and ninety-six classes for the younger boys, for instance, we find seventy-seven general and thirty-seven technical teachers who devote to the work all their time and two hundred and twenty-one elementary-school teachers and one hundred and eleven technical and professional teachers who give instruction in their specialties as a side function, and one hundred and sixty teachers of religion. The essential point for an American spectator is, however, that the instruction for those thousands of young people in the midst of their practical life is given in the best hours of the day, either in the morning or in the afternoon, and that the employers are obliged to give them the opportunity to attend from six to ten hours a week for four years. Obligatory instruction in the evening when the young people come fatigued from their daily labor is excluded by the scheme. There is perhaps at present in the system of German school work no feature which so much deserves the attention of the American reformer as this whole plan of continuation schools as developed in the city of Munich and as more or less similarly organized in a large number of German cities.

Yet after spending a year in the educational atmosphere of Germany, if I think over what is the essential element which I should like to bring to our school work

here, I doubt whether any special institution or special scheme ought to be mentioned. Different social conditions demand different educational plans, and on both sides the times are favorable for the elaboration and organization of that of which the nation at school is in need. While German education is favored by its traditions and by the thoroughness of the governmental administration, American education is no less favored by the wealth of the people which allows not only excellent equipment, but which above all permits the youth to remain in the schoolroom through more years than other nations can afford. But while America will surely take care of every detail, and develops and will develop more and more educational features which may truly be models for Europe, I feel the real difference—and not as a son of Germany, but as a teacher of American sons, I should rather say—the real defect here in the spirit which moves this educational machinery and in the attitude which is taken toward the intellectual material. The American nation is full of enthusiasm for education, believes thoroughly in the dissemination of knowledge and in the importance of education for citizenship, and the educational circles themselves are rapturously eager for the improvement of the educational schemes. All this is excellent and admirable, and yet it cannot reach the ideal aim and cannot perform the wonderful miracle. This edu-

tional eagerness after all refers to externalities, but what is needed still more is the spirit of belief in the value of knowledge. For the typical American the knowledge or the training implanted is something which draws its value from its importance for a certain examination or a certain degree or a certain possibility to reach through it something else. This is as true of the student in college as of the child in the elementary school and in spite of its many exceptions of the average college professor. One of the greatest European scientists on returning home from an exchange year at an American university condensed his impressions into the remark that he had never heard from university colleagues so much talking about education and so little about scholarly problems. The average student reads just as many pages in his textbook as are prescribed for his college course, but he lacks the impulse to make adventurous excursions into regions which no teacher has shown to him. In this way the American student may even read more than the average German student, because his daily routine work is better supervised. Yet among the German students are more individuals who are glowing with the desire to know, who on their own resources plunge into passionate research and who spend wonderful nights in excited debates with their chums on purely theoretical problems. And exactly this spirit goes down to the lowest schools and goes up

to the highest. This fundamental difference is hardly felt by one who stands in the midst of the daily routine work and is doing his share in the gigantic mill of American education, but whenever a man spends a while among the German schools, high or low, and then comes back, a period of readjustment is necessary in which he vividly feels the contrast and in which he cannot help thinking that after all the crown of real intellectual mastership will come to this nation only if something of that foreign spirit and belief penetrates its educational atmosphere.

PSYCHOLOGY AND THE NAVY.

This essay first appeared in the North American Review

PSYCHOLOGY AND THE NAVY¹

FOR the first general address of your naval course you have invited a man who has never stepped on the deck of a warship except to attend some jolly afternoon tea or a dance or a luncheon, when the guns were decorated with flowers. Of course this means that your guest, while deeply honored by the generosity of your request, cannot dare to contribute even the least word of information or knowledge to the study of those technical, strategical and practical problems which have drawn you to these famous halls. But it seems to me that your willingness to step so far outside of your vocational circle and to admit a psychologist to your council indicates a new and significant attitude toward your work and your duties. And this attitude may appear surprising to not a few. The world is full of the glory of the development of modern battleships, full of admiration for the tremendous material values which they represent and for the technical triumphs which are achieved by the perfection of their guns and machinery. The world of newspaper readers is hypnotized by the

¹ An address delivered before the officers of the United States Naval War College at Newport, R. I., June 5, 1912.

stupendous possibilities which the dreadnaughts of our day have created and its imagination is excited by the improvements and inventions, by the torpedoes and the submarines and the turrets which make the naval battle of the future the most gigantic technical problem of the age. But in the midst of this unquestioning enthusiasm for the material development and the physical progress of the battleship, you stand for the conviction that it is after all the man, man's thought, and man's emotion and man's will which is of decisive importance. You do not submit to the popular prejudice which expects success only from the marvels of steel and powder and electricity. You have learned too well the great lesson of history which demonstrates that throughout four thousand years the victory has been with the ships of those who were fit to win. It is not true that fate has been with the heavy guns; it has always been with the great minds. The knowledge of the ships and the armament becomes a living power only if it is embedded in the understanding of strategics and grand tactics, and they would be empty if the psyche of man were not acknowledged as their center. With this background of feelings you have turned to psychology to inquire whether the study of the mind may be made serviceable to the navy in peace or in war.

The psychologist of a few years ago would have felt embarrassed if men of that great world in which guns

are pointed and battles fought should have come as intruders into his quiet laboratory rooms where he was carrying on his patient researches into the traits and the mechanism of the human mind. His science had grown up far from the turmoil of the world of clashing interests in the repose and quietude of pure academic life. Psychologists studied consciousness, its laws and its surprising developments with all the means of exact modern methods, but never with a thought of dragging the results into the marketplaces and of making practical use of that which was sought for knowledge' sake only. But the last few years have brought a radical change. The treasures of knowledge which were heaped up in the storehouses of the modern psychologist have at last been coined and made serviceable to the demands of the day. The psychologists began to aid the efforts of the schoolteachers who had too long forgotten that the human mind of the pupil is the only important element in the school; they began to help the physicians who had too long neglected the fundamental rôle which the mind plays in the health and disease of the patient; they began to aid the lawyer and the judge who had too long dealt with crime without analyzing the criminal's mind; they even began to aid the merchant and the captain of industry whose customers and whose laborers are minds which may be studied with profit from the point of view of psychological science.

They have served the social reformer and the vocational counselor, even the artist and the minister; in short, they have in recent years developed an applied psychology which stands to the theoretical work of our laboratories as the science of the engineer stands to physics or chemistry. It is a psychotechnical science which cannot acknowledge barriers where the human mind is working in the interplay of social energies. Commanding a ship or fulfilling the orders of the commander, shaping the plans of a battle or pointing the gun, directing a submarine or aiming a torpedo, sending the wireless message or even feeding the engines in the hold of the ship while the cannons are thundering, is an activity of the mind, and it is not only the right but the duty of the psychologist to consider conscientiously whether his science may not be applied in this realm of human efficiency too.

The problems which might most naturally suggest themselves at the very threshold are those which are common to the seafaring world independent of whether the ship is to fight or peacefully to carry passengers and freight from shore to shore, the problems of navigation. We ought not to overlook the fact that certain elements of exact psychology indeed entered the naval service quite a number of years ago. I refer to the study of colorblindness. No one has a right to become a seaman who is unable to discriminate the color signals

of the passing ships, but these facts of colorblindness which are to-day such a matter of course in the naval world had to be slowly examined by psychological studies, and the tests by which these abnormalities of the human eye are traced are still being steadily elaborated in the workshops of the psychologists. Even in this apparently wellknown little field, the psychologist goes on discovering new phenomena. Many types of color weakness and color deficiency can be traced to-day which a few years ago would still have escaped the notice of the experimenter and the more intimately the naval service remains in contact with the progress of these sense studies by introducing the newest subtle methods of testing, the greater the chance of eliminating mistakes which might spell disaster. I am inclined to believe that variations and deficiencies of hearing, well known to the psychologist, may be of a certain significance too in the problems of navigation. Only in recent years has a careful psychological study been devoted to the mental conditions of the localization of sound. How far is the coöperation of the two ears necessary in order to determine exactly the direction, and what angles of deviation can be discerned and what directions of sound may be confused with one another? No one of these laboratory studies was undertaken with practical purposes in view, and yet it seems probable that the officer who is to determine the direction of the

foghorn's sound would profit from an acquaintance with such psychological investigations, and that psychological tests might eliminate many a man from the list of those who are considered competent to judge the sounds in a fog. The new duty of listening to the submarine bells involves other acoustical functions which may also make psychological inquiries advisable.

But the mental analysis would trace strong individual differences with regard to many other features that might mean good or evil for the profession of the navigator. The officer on the bridge is in a very different position according to whether his mental imagery is of the visual or of the motor-acoustical type. The one may carry in consciousness a vivid picture of the map of the shore with its lighthouses and signals while the other may possess his knowledge in the form of words and figures. Both may know the same data, and each kind of knowledge has its particular advantages for certain purposes but the two minds take an entirely different attitude toward the channel through which they have to pass, and the difference may be momentous. Still more important are the psychological differences in the ability of men to observe distant objects and to keep a faithful memory of a series of events to which the attention has been turned. The absurd contradictions in the reports of witnesses before the court provoked the psychological study of the abil-

ity for giving testimony. Thousands of experiments have been devoted to the question under the exact conditions of the laboratory experiment. We know now how misleading the reports of the most sincere witnesses may be, how illusions may slip in in spite of the most serious intentions, how the subjective feeling of certainty may deceive us point for point, and above all how great the individual differences are in the faithfulness of mental reports. The sea serpent stories of all regions have indicated how the sea is the most favorable background for the illusions of mental perception. We know from recent studies that for instance a quick succession of similar impressions produces a mutual inhibition through which some are eliminated from the range of our attention. The psychologist has found many such subtle traits of our attention which interfere with our observations and if we think how much depends upon the observation of the naval officer on the commercial ship as well as on the man of war we can foresee that the time must come when the studies of the psychologist will not be ignored in the navy. Moreover we find by experimental inquiry that the power of observation is dependent upon individual features and that accordingly one man may be excellent in one kind of observation and entirely unreliable in another kind in spite of his personal feeling that he is exerting an equal effort. These individual differences

must be tested in order to find which man is particularly fit for a certain kind of observation and whose judgment is unreliable. Similar psychological tests would be advisable for the spotter on the mast and for the men in many another position.

To illustrate these possibilities of psychological tests which may be applied in the interest of navigation I may characterize at least one a little more in detail. The officer on the bridge may know exactly what he has to do under normal conditions and may be perfectly able to figure out carefully the right decision in case of an unusual, unexpected, complex situation if he has plenty of time to judge on the relative value of the various factors involved. But the ultimate proof of the man comes when the unexpected happens and no time is left for the slow decision. A quick decision must be made or destruction of ship or life will follow. A vessel or a rock or a wreck may suddenly loom up in the midst, and a collision is inevitable unless the right actions are quickly chosen, and this means unless rapidly and yet correctly the comparative importance and influence of the conditions is grasped. Only the man who can live up to this demand of an emergency is the born leader of a ship, as far as mere navigation is concerned. Experience for which mankind has dearly paid has shown that there are two types of men who utterly fail. One type becomes paralyzed under the

pressure of the sudden responsibility. The feeling that a decision must be quickly reached inhibits in him every impulse to action, his mind comes to a standstill. Before he reaches any decision at all the chances are gone, and the disaster can no longer be averted. The other type instantly opens the channels of motor discharge but the flood of impulses rushes into any chance course and a haphazard result, a foolish decision or an unconsidered hasty action is the outcome. The right man is of the third type which under the pressure of danger without loss of time instinctively grasps the whole complex situation, is not carried away by any chance impression, does not overlook what is significant in the unexpected event, sees the important things great and the insignificant small. Coolly he chooses in immediate response the attitude which he would take if he had time for careful deliberation. Are we to wait until an emergency arises to find out whether the right type of personality is in command? May not the penalty of this postponement be measureless loss of valuable lives? A leading ship company raised this neglected question recently with great earnestness and invited me as psychologist to consider whether our laboratory could not devise a scheme by which this ability to judge rapidly and yet correctly could be tested and measured. I tried many schemes — at first very complicated ones, but slowly I settled on an extremely simple device which brings

out with surprising clearness the mental differences and the variations of those three types of behaviour. The device looks like a little game. I use twenty-four cards each of which contains four rows of twelve capital letters. They are all A's, E's, O's and U's. Some of the cards contain twenty-one of one of the four letters and nine each of the three others, some contain eighteen of the one and ten each of the others and some fifteen of the one and eleven each of the three others. The letters are in an entirely irregular order and every card at the first glance looks almost bewildering. The task of the man to be tested is to stare at one card and to decide as quickly as possible which of the four letters is the most frequent one. It is evident that this is much more difficult if the most frequent letter occurs only fifteen times than when it occurs twenty-one times, but even in the latter case it is not easy to do it without any help by counting for which of course no time is allowed. The full experiment consists in making this decision as quickly as possible for every one of the twenty-four cards, and the objective test is made by the demand that the subject of the experiment arrange the cards with the greatest possible speed in four piles, in the first those in which the A is predominant, in the second the E, in the third the O and in the fourth the U. Then we measure the time from the signal to begin to the moment of laying down the last card and afterward we

count the number of times a card has been put into the wrong pile. Through a test which takes only a few minutes we thus arrive at a sorting of men according to their quickness or sluggishness, deliberateness or inability to make a prompt decision. It is surprising how often men tested with this simple device confess that the result expresses exactly the experience which they have passed through when life called them to a sudden decision in an unexpected complex situation. Nevertheless I am far from saying that the ideal of a test for this particular demand has been reached in this proposition. Still more suitable schemes may be invented in the future, but at least we no longer have any right to ignore the problem and to disregard the possibilities which experimental psychology offers and to wait until the events of life carry on the experiments with disastrous results. Yet for us here I have discussed this particular case only as an illustration of the method by which the experimental psychologist with his miniature repetitions of life tasks may seek the right man for the right place, even on the bridge of the ship or in the crow's nest or in the engine room.

The officer in the navy, however, does not think primarily of those psychological features which are as important for the ocean greyhounds of the commercial fleet as for his ironclad floating fortresses. His interest naturally turns to those traits of the mind which

are more directly connected with the success or failure in warfare. Hence let us consider that wide region of higher mental activities, the interplay of emotion and volition, judgment and imagination, intellect and instinct. But then we do best in our survey to discriminate between the minds of the officers and those of the crew. What are the mental characteristics of the many to whom the few have to give their orders? One psychological fact ought to stand in the foreground and ought never to be forgotten. The many are not simply a large number of single minds; they are not only many, but they are at the same time one. They are held together — more, they are forged together into one compact mental mass in which no single mind which entered has remained unchanged in its structure or in its energies. Let us by no means believe that this is only a metaphor or a picturesque expression which is to symbolize the fact that those hundreds of men have certain ideas or desires or emotions or feelings or prejudices or hopes or fears in common and that the superior may simply rely on these common factors and accordingly ignore the individual differences among the men. Their unity is not a simple uniformity; their minds are interrelated and not simply added to one another. Yet we must keep just as far from any reminiscences of popular mystical ideas, as if by a kind of telepathy one mind reached out to another and fused with it in a

spiritual communion. Seen from a psychological standpoint the personality is completely confined to the impressions, memories, imaginations, emotions and volitions which originate in its own compass and no mind can intrude into this closed individuality. Whatever comes to the individual mind from without must come through the senses in the form of impressions and sense perceptions. But when those impressions are perceptions not of the dead things around us but of living beings animated by interests like ours and engaged in action with us, the impression influences the whole setting of the mind in one characteristic direction. The psychologist characterizes this as an increase of suggestibility. The particular man becomes more suggestible to all propositions which his senses receive from his companions. This psychophysical increase of suggestibility transforms the individuals now into a crowd, now into a rushing mob, now into an enthusiastic army, and whoever deals with such a group of men in which everyone knows himself as a part of the coöperating whole must be fully aware of the advantages and of the dangers which are created by this reënforcement of suggestibility.

Suggestibility in the view of the modern psychologist means the readiness to accept suggestions, and suggestions are never anything but propositions for actions. In ordinary talk we speak of suggestions of ideas, but

in a stricter sense this is misleading. Not the idea itself becomes the object of the suggestion but either the proposition to act according to a certain idea or the proposition to believe in the reality of a certain idea. If we suggest the idea of a flower garden to a hypnotized man within the walls of his room, we do not simply awake the imaginative idea before his mind. We might awake such an imaginative picture of a garden in any normal mind by speaking about it without hypnotism and without suggestion. What characterizes the abnormal state of the hypnotized is that he is ready to accept the proposition that such a garden really surrounds him, and accordingly he begins to pick the roses from his chairs and tables. He accepts those ideas as real, and this is indeed ultimately nothing but an attitude and his action an action of submission and of acknowledgment. All suggestions refer in this way to the inner or outer doings of men. Now ordinarily if we propose an action to our neighbor, the idea of the purpose may interest him and if no objections arise in his mind and no impulses of his oppose, the idea of the action automatically transforms itself into a real attitude or activity. But it may just as well happen that our proposition awakes in his mind the idea that the consequences of the action would be disagreeable or that it would be useless or foolish or perhaps even criminal, or that he would be unable to carry it out, or

that a risk would be connected with it or that it would be against the rules, and anyone of these associated ideas might overcome the impulse to carry out the proposition. He refuses to do what we invited him to undertake because the opposing idea proves to be the stronger. But the idea of an action may be proposed to us with such vividness and warmth, with such a striking tone of authority or with such insistent persuasiveness that all those resisting associations are suppressed and inhibited. The inner opposition is overwhelmed, the proposed action is carried out, and in the case that a proposition has such a power to inhibit the opposing ideas, we call it suggestion. But this effect may result not only from the impressiveness and persuasiveness; it may result and does result still oftener from an inner state of the man. He may have come into a readiness to yield to propositions which he would otherwise resist, to perform acts which would normally appear to him silly or dangerous. This inner change is the increase of suggestibility. Emotional excitement, over-fatigue, certain drugs, produce this change. If the change reaches its maximum degree, we call it hypnosis, as the hypnotic state is indeed nothing but highly increased suggestibility. But with normal men there is no more effective cause for the increase of suggestibility than the forming of a mass in which everyone sees and knows that all the others share his fate, have the same

to perform and to enjoy and to suffer. The children in a class, the laborers in a factory, the voters in a mass meeting, the spectators on the bleachers at a game, the crowd assembled at a fire or an accident, form various types of such organized units held together by increased suggestibility through which every single member is liable to act in a way which would be unnatural to him if he were alone. He may do acts or say things or risk dangers which he would fear if he stood by himself. He has not really become more courageous but his increased suggestibility makes him imitative and ready to do what the others seem willing to do and to ignore the warning voice of his reason or his cowardice. He also becomes a little more foolish than he would be in isolation, he may shout words or indulge in actions which would appear to him silly or inconsiderate if he were alone, but the crowd consciousness has control of him; he has become insensitive to the opposing voice of wisdom. He laughs where he would never laugh alone, he runs away where his normal instincts would teach him to hold on, he gets discouraged or excited where the cold facts would not warrant either. The mass can hold his mind down to a level far below its true nature and can lift it up to a height which it could never reach unsupported.

Among all lasting conditions of human life no one seems more predisposed to create this increased sug-

gestibility of a mass than the life on a warship. Every man on board feels how his fate is bound up with that of all the others. He knows that they all are detached for months and years from the life of the millions, they feel the same pulse of the engines, they are lifted by the same waves, they know that the same danger would threaten all of them. The individual has given up a part of his possibilities. If the hour of a battle were to come, every man knows that for him no individual rushing forward is possible as for the soldiers on the battlefield. He cannot escape the ship which carries them all and with which they all will sink if it goes to the bottom. A closer union of a multitude of strangers cannot be imagined; the suggestibility must therefore be tremendously increased and that means that the powers of the man are reënforced for good or for evil, that his individual resistance to the imitative impulses is decreased and that he has become to a certain degree a passive instrument for the will of the leader. No superior can fail to make the fullest use of this power and to be aware of the lurking dangers. He must know that this increased suggestibility could be the condition for a panic among men no single one of whom would be frightened. But at the same time he can rely on it that this suggestibility would insure an enthusiastic and heroic fight, if the right impulse and the right start are given, and that every single man may then be carried

far beyond the range of his individual spontaneity. As to the technical side of this control of the mass, one rule may be immediately deduced from these psychological principles. If crowd consciousness is really only increased suggestibility, and suggestibility is only readiness to act according to a proposition, it will be of utmost importance to give the signal for any turn of mind by an impulse to real action. Do not try to awake any ideas or conceptions or judgments but release an action in the right direction by forcing any one man to carry it out or better still by making the movement yourself, and you have won your case. One forward movement bears the whole mass forward, one backward movement ruins all. Even if you only go through the motions of an action to give an illusory suggestion of it which would not convince the individual, it will carry away the excited mass.

This suggestibility of the social group which composes the crew stands in an especially significant relation to the mental function which after all is the backbone of military service, obedience. Where the spirit of discipline is lacking, the military cause is lost. There never has been a victorious navy without obedience. To a certain degree the necessity of a dogged submission to the order has in the most modern ship become still more necessary than ever before because the individual man is more isolated in his duties than in former

times. He does not know what is going on in the battle, he does not see the others, he cannot understand the situation, he cannot lose a moment of time to find out what is going on, he simply has to obey his orders as long as life flickers in his soul. He cannot even be trained for this obedience in the hour of battle, because all training and all exercises and all maneuver necessarily eliminate the mental factor which is ultimately the most important in the hour of the real fight, the emotion of fear. Whether the man will carry out the movements which the maneuver has taught when the cannons not only are thundering but the balls really are splintering the ship depends upon the one decisive question of whether an obedient submission to the order of the superior has become an instinct for his mind. And here begins that complex relation to the suggestibility of the crew, inasmuch as the spirit of obedience itself is reënforced by the unified social consciousness of the mass, while on the other hand the obedient carrying out of the order disturbs the social consciousness. I say the spirit of obedience is in itself fostered by the increased suggestibility with its imitativeness. To be obedient is the common function of all the men. They feel themselves as parts of that one unified organic fighting machine which can fulfill its purpose only if strict discipline controls it, and the willingness to submit therefore becomes infectious. Hence the order of

the commander is the highest duty for everyone and that contagious, imitative enthusiasm for the common cause against the enemy in every individual takes the form of an unquestioning spirit of subordination. The officer can therefore expect a much greater spirit of obedience from a member of that socialized group than from any single individual.

But on the other hand the order goes from the commander to the man directly, and he has to fulfill his share without reference to what the other members of the crew have to do. To demand obedience to the order which is given to him individually may mean to force on him resistance to the suggestions of the social consciousness. Indeed it is no real obedience unless it is strong enough to break up the unified will of the crowd. In this sense their education toward obedience demands a relentless suppression of the general suggestibility. The men must be trained by real discipline to have control of themselves against all suggestions of their mates and to inhibit in their minds all merely imitative and yielding impulses. The psychologist knows no other way of training such a power of self-control but by a persistent strengthening and disciplining of the attention and the will. We all know how much this self-discipline is weakened by the corrupting indulgence with which our modern age coddles the youth. We know how a pseudo-education which is controlled by

fads and fancies fosters those go as you please methods which yield to the whims and likings of the petted boys and girls and how this pampered youth learns an abundance of scattered bits of knowledge but fails to learn what alone makes life worth living, the power of attention and will which enforces the dutiful action against all temptations. The result is the superficiality of our public life with the lack of resistance to sensational and hysterical influences. Our whole modern world instinctively longs again for thoroughness and discipline and the teaching of obedience. But the army and navy at least never lessen the firm grip of authority, and every officer ought to understand the mental conditions under which discipline can be developed. One psychological consideration must stand in the foreground. Discipline is the product of habit and habit cannot become deep-rooted where any exceptions are admitted. Habits result from the physiological law that the uninterrupted repetition of actions transforms the nervous path into a path of less and less resistance. The submission to the order given and the faithful performance of the duty in spite of all counter stimulations must be secured by such habituation of the brain paths. We cannot expect that the man will be always ready to play the hero and to force his energies to a maximum and to make great sacrifices in order to be obedient. The routine effect of a strong discipline can be reached only

if this submission has become so habitual that it works as a matter of course without any need of excessive effort. The service must have made the man an exact machine which works automatically whenever the order reaches his consciousness.

Yet the true meaning of military discipline would be entirely missed if automatic obedience were considered as the only important demand and if another postulate were neglected which stands in every respect coördinate, the demand for a spirit of initiative. Without this spirit the fighter would become a slave and no nation can rely on its moral slaves. Initiative does not stand in a psychological contradiction to obedience. On the contrary even the training in obedience demands a background of initiative, as the overcoming of the resistance will be successful only if every single act of submission is supported by a feeling of confidence and reliance in the leader and this reliance, however much it may result from the imitative crowd consciousness, remains ultimately an act of personality and initiative. But the spontaneity which the service has to develop in every man must go far beyond this mere internal free option for a leader. The commander controls a well-disciplined crew only if he can know that every man is ready to give orders in the spirit of the whole to himself when orders from above are lacking. Every man in the crew must be able and must be conscious of his ability to step

into a position of responsibility. His intelligence and power of decision accordingly demand as much stimulation as his habit of submission. It is this which ennobles the modern navy and gives to it values far beyond those of a mere mechanical fighting machine. The idea is widespread that different views are possible on this question, that some nations do not believe in the initiative of the individuals because they are afraid that it will interfere with obedience and think that the automatic, machine-like functioning of the crew ought to be the ideal. For instance it is a widespread belief among the officers of the American navy that this contrast of view characterizes the difference between the American and the German navy, the Americans believing in the spirit of initiative, the Germans in the spirit of obedience. Would it not be misleading to awake the impression that an American naval officer undervalues the importance of obedience? After a serious study of this problem with reference to the German navy, I feel convinced that it is equally misleading to fancy that the leading men of the German navy believe less in the absolute value of the spirit of initiative in the navy than the Americans. I should rather say that the development of the last twenty years, as it is reflected in the German navy literature and in the spirit of the German navy officers, finds its real center in the persistent effort to create a strong sense of initiative and of individual

responsibility and personal freedom in every man who is to fight on board of the cruiser. Initiative and obedience ought to belong together in the psychology of the naval man the world over.

We have spoken so far only of the psychology which the officer ought to know in order to understand his subordinates, but we have not spoken of the psychology of the officer himself. What are the significant features of his mind? To a certain degree, to be sure, he is not only in the same boat; he is also of the same mold of mind. He too is a part of that compact unity with its social consciousness and its increased suggestibility, sharing the common enthusiasm and sharing the common fears, and above all he too must combine the spirit of obedience with the spirit of initiative, however much the obedience is shaded into an intelligent carrying out of instructions as against the mechanical fulfillment of orders and the initiative is heightened to a sense of responsibility toward every man on board and toward the nation. But in so far as the officer stands detached from the crew, the mental characteristics which are necessary for him are to a high degree dependent upon those psychological conditions of the crew. If the men are a suggestible mass, it is he who needs the power of suggestion. He must train in himself and develop to highest efficiency that unwavering firmness which overwhelms an easily impressed crowd and forces on it the

will of the leader. If the officer shows signs of hesitation and of weak willingness to yield, lack of determination or erratic fluctuation, his influence is paralyzed. Only the man of suggestive power can stop a panic by one short word or one vivid movement, and by one gesture can transform fear into daring courage. Such suggestive power must draw its strength from autosuggestion. An officer who allows himself to grow tired by the monotony of the service or by the exhausting work on board, or who becomes nervous or fussy or irritated, or who instinctively shrinks from the responsibility and always waits for the counsel of others, slowly loses the autosuggestive hold on himself which is even more important than any knowledge. Whatever he can do to strengthen his nervous system, to enrich his intellect, to widen his horizon, to keep his instincts vigorous and his imagination vivid, his inspirations high and his will decisions quick, all ought to contribute to that reliance on himself which strengthens the power of his autosuggestive thought. Only then is he a true commander and leader. The difficulties which he has to overcome are multifold, as the conditions and the strain of the service work strongly toward automatization of his mental life, and this means a weakening of that power of command with its independent self-reliance and its need for inexhaustible autosuggestion. He has to overcome the resistance by sport and

training, by social comradery with his equals, by joy in the service as such, by intellectual interest in his duties and by passionate love for his task, but above all by a systematic training of his will power.

This emphasis on the emotional traits of the leader does not contradict the demand which seems paramount in a war college, the training of abilities. However much an officer may have learned concerning ships and guns and ammunition, and even concerning the history of warfare, the knowledge alone does not prepare him for the great work which he is called to perform for the good of the nation in peace and in war. The development of abilities such as have to be shown in the movements of the fleet or in the battle is dependent upon mental activities for which no mere knowledge can be substituted. They stand much nearer to art than to knowledge. We find this contrast in every field of human interests. The youngest pupil in a school has to gather some information and has to learn facts accessible to knowledge, and on the other hand has to win and exercise abilities. His power to read or to write or to calculate demands actual performance and can never be gained by mere theoretical demonstration. This doubleness remains the same through all stages of schooling up to highest technical and professional preparations for lifework. The surgeon must learn his knowledge of medicine and exercise his abil-

ity to perform the operation. Yet these abilities which have to be acquired are acts of our minds and nervous systems. It is not necessary to train them on exactly those objects for which they are finally to be used. The only essential requirement is that really the same mental and physiological functions be involved which are needed in the decisive hour. To go through a real battle would be an impossible preparation. To go through a maneuver is of course only an approach, as every sham battle leaves out the real hatred of the enemy and therefore changes the final mental situation. But even such maneuvers with actual ships go far beyond what the routine training can bring to the individual officer. Hence he is obliged to reduce the mental situation still more and to substitute a naval war game and the mastery of theoretical naval war problems of actual warfare for the genuine fight. But if these miniature battles and these schematized wars of the college room are well arranged, they can become a substitute in which the most essential mental functions of warfare are actually exercised. The psychologist cannot too earnestly advise that emphasis be laid on such practical exercises. The training in all our technical activities from writing with a pen to mastering a musical instrument or a scientific apparatus demonstrates in ever new forms that the mere ability to go through the component acts of a complex action is not sufficient

to guarantee success in the complex action itself. We must always consider the synthesizing of the part actions as a task in itself which needs independent training. An officer may have learned to do this and to do that and to respond to one condition in this and to another condition in that way, but he can never feel himself prepared for the right decision and right performance in the unified complex situation of the battle, if he has not thoroughly trained himself in responding to the whole complexity of the situation. In every complex activity the whole is endlessly more than the mere sum of the parts, and this is conditioned by the hierarchic structure of our psychophysical system. The various layers of psychophysical units one higher than the other have to take charge of the organization of our motor responses. In the first few weeks the man who is learning telegraphy only tries as quickly as possible to give the signals for the single letters and the curve of his speed shows a steady ascendance until he knows how to produce the single letter with the greatest possible speed. Then he reaches a period of standstill, until he is fully trained in this elementary ability, but afterward he enters into the second stage of training and learns to telegraph not letters but whole words and his speed in telegraphy quickly rises. In this second period he learns to synthesize the motor impulses for the single letters into complex movement innervations for whole

words. This new ability is acquired after several months and then begins again a time of standstill. Finally he reaches the period of acquiring the highest ability, not accessible to everyone, namely the synthesizing of the word impulses into still more complex activities in which one motor stroke gives the impulse for the telegraphing of a whole phrase composed of several words. In this way the officer must learn to synthesize the thousand partial activities which he has learned as factors of the naval service. He needs exercise in that whole very complex setting from which the special actions then spring with automatic necessity.

While in this way ability must be developed in opposition to mere knowledge, it is not fair to underestimate the knowledge. There are some who claim that such ability is instinct and that instinctive activities are essentially dependent upon inborn powers. The right commander sees by intuition what he must do in the decisive moment. He has not even time to consider deliberately what possibilities are open, but with instinctive certainty he chooses the right one. This is perfectly true and yet entirely false. What we call our instinct in such cases is not an inborn disposition like that for satisfying hunger or thirst; it is nothing but an ability to respond to the complex stimulus without a conscious awareness of the special steps which lead to the end. But in order to gain such an instinctive ability,

the connections must have been formed by persistent exercises into which perfectly conscious intentions and careful knowledge and learning have entered. The piano virtuoso plays without being conscious of the particular movements which at first had to be slowly learned. We all write and we all speak instinctively without choosing the special words or the special writing movements, but we had to learn them by slow study. Everything which we acquire through assiduous learning to-day has a chance of being transformed to-morrow into instinctive behavior which serves the ends without our being conscious of the steps which lead to them. It is a kind of mental abbreviation, a short-cut which can never be reached without industry and patience. The officer who devotes faithful years of study perhaps to the history of naval warfare and earnestly thinks himself into the situation of every decisive battle forms connections in his mind between the ideas of certain situations and the ideas of certain necessary responses and reactions which slowly become part of his instinctive behavior and actions.

We have said that every pupil in a school and every student in a profession has to learn knowledge and has to acquire abilities. But the aim of education could never be reached by those two ways alone. A third factor is necessary to complete the meaning of the school. Interests must be stimulated. Knowledge

and abilities would be dead and useless unless a living interest stood behind them. Even the smallest child must have at least the interest of curiosity or of sympathy, and on a higher level we stimulate the logical and ethical and æsthetic interests in order to prepare the youth for a valuable lifework. The interest which guides the scholar is not that which fascinates the artist, and the interest which impels the physician is not that which stimulates the lawyer, and the interest which inspires the minister is not that which stirs the statesman. But there is no calling high or humble in which an emotional interest does not give force and meaning to the knowledge and abilities of the man. The knowledge and the ability of the naval officer, the one resulting from the intellectual functions of his mind, the other from the volitional powers of his mind would indeed be deprived of their real efficiency and value unless a strong, deep stream of interest flowed from the emotions of his mind. These interests may be of many kinds. But it holds true of every vocation that many motives are intertwined in the mind. The surgeon is anxious to receive his fees in order to earn his livelihood, and this mercenary motive is combined with the social one of his ambition to have a respected name in the community for his professional work, and both motives are combined with the intellectual one of a serious interest in the scientific problems of his medical work,

and yet even these three groups of motives would never make him a true physician and would never inspire him enough for the great tasks which he may have to perform at a bedside if there were not the ethical motive of the desire to help suffering mankind. In a similar way we may disentangle personal and social and idealistic motive elements in every vocation, but in none does their coöperation seem more important than in the mental structure of the naval officer. Of course there must be personal motives involved. The officer must think of earning his livelihood, of filling an honorable position, of advancing as quickly as possible in his career. But motives on a much higher level, motives which do not refer to the individual as such but to ideal aims and purposes must be intimately associated with the personal ones. He must feel joy in the service as such, he must have interest in the details of the work and in the problems which it offers, he must be determined by a consciousness of duty which gives him perfect satisfaction when he is loyal to his task, whatever sacrifices it may demand. Yet here again we must insist that even all these motives of a higher order are not sufficient to guarantee the ideal perfection of the officer's achievement. There must be one motive which is still deeper rooted and which lies far beyond mere personal consideration. What is needed as the central energy in the mind of the naval officer is an en-

thusiastic belief in the ideal value of the navy and the task of the navy. The teacher can never give his best if he is not inspired by the ideal belief in the incomparable value of educating the youth. The artist and the scholar cannot create works of lasting glory if they do not live in an unquestioning belief in the sacred mission of beauty and truth. The minister cannot be a true preacher if pure religion is not the center of his soul. Such a belief, such an inspiration, such a religion, must penetrate and fill the mind of the officer. With every fiber of his personality he must feel that it is sacred work to which he is called, that the mission of the navy is an ideal one and that the honor of the country is not too dearly paid for by his death. The psychologist sees in all these demands for the highest unselfish motives not simply beautiful phrases and romantic illusions. Even though he abstracts from the higher moral aspect and simply takes the standpoint of description and explanation, he must acknowledge that such an emotional belief is the strongest reservoir of the energies for psychophysical action. The teacher and the minister, the artist and the scholar, and with them the officer, may perform every single activity which is needed for their lifework by the mere interplay of ideas, by learning and training. But in every case the available power for activity would easily be exhausted. Any friction would interfere with the possible success,

any selfish desire would inhibit the impulses, fatigue would weaken the work, chance distractions and temptations would lead to side activities. Wherever one great emotional motive synthesizes the lifework, the psychophysical energy can overcome those frictions and those temptations, those selfish motives, those difficulties and dangers. This is true of the mind of the masses as well as of the individuals. The maximum effort and the faithful endurance through the hour of danger presupposes that high-pitched tension for which mere intellectual processes can never be a substitute. The psychologist therefore, without any emotionalism on his part but for strictly scientific reasons must demand that every factor be inhibited which interferes with a whole-hearted surrender to the sacredness of the naval cause.

The daily routine work may easily be carried on by officers and men who lack this belief, and the smoothness of their performance may deceive the world concerning the perfunctory character of their service. The interference with this ultimately decisive attitude may result from many conditions. Among the bluejackets a great mental inhibition may come from the tendency to change the vocation. English observers seem to believe that here lies the central mental difficulty of the American navy, since it must be acknowledged that in no other country are the rank and file of the population

so easily inclined to change from one vocation to another. The minds of the officers on the other hand are perhaps most easily harmed by what has often been called the spirit of the steamyachtsman. The steamyachtsman danger is psychologically especially grave, because it so easily creeps in without at first allowing anyone to perceive the difference between the right and the wrong attitude. The steamyachtsman loves the ship and its handling, enjoys the life on the water, is deeply interested in all naval movements; and yet the whole setting of his mind is fundamentally wrong for the officer who has to prepare himself and his men for the heroic work in the crisis. It is a spirit of ease and comfort, of charming hospitality and delightful companionship, of self-satisfaction and goodnatured sportsmanship. In many a foreign navy the true believers in sea power dislike for this reason to see too many rich officers in the service, as their spirit of comfort and relaxation spreads this steamyachtsman attitude. There are not a few who believe that this difference alone was the real reason for the victory of the Japanese navy in which such a steamyachtsman element does not exist over the Russian navy in which it is said to be widespread. But the social psychologist cannot overlook a still more dangerous rock which is threatening under the surface. The whole civilized world is to-day filled not only with the

old vague wish for peace, but with a more modern conviction that means can be found to secure peace and to make war superfluous. The American nation is among the leaders in this international movement and no educated man has a right to close his eyes to this tremendous problem of civilization. But just because it is appealing to an ideal demand and carries with it the promises of highest humanity, it is much more dangerous to the inner unity of the officer's mind than a mere appeal to comfort and selfishness. The mind of the warrior is thrown into a conflict between the demands of his lifework and the siren voices of the eternal peace advocates. How can the enthusiastic belief in the preparedness for war and in the relentlessness of the fight prevail in a mind which is touched by the doubt whether war among civilized nations is not brutal and immoral and criminal. It is one of the most important conditions for the success of the navy that such inner wavering be absolutely excluded from the officer's mind. He is not for that purpose obliged to fall back to a barbaric hatred of the enemy with the mere longing to kill, nor has he to narrow his horizon and ignorantly to ignore those international peace movements. All that is needed is for him to see them in the right perspective. He will not deny the harm and the losses which war brings with it. But at the same time he will be deeply impressed by the tremendous moral power of a national

self-defense which concentrates the energies of the whole nation in loyalty to its historical mission. He must grasp the fundamental rôle of war in the history of mankind as the great vehicle of progress, as the great eradicator of egotism, as the great educator to a spirit of sacrifice and duty. Moreover he must recognize how the state forms in which mankind has developed have been bound up with national rivalry and war, and how our present age in spite of its palace of international arbitration at The Hague seems further removed from warlessness than many a previous period. And as soon as he has recognized that war is necessary and as soon as he has chosen to serve the nation for its military work, no argument against war ought to interfere with the unified setting of his loyal mind. A scholar may be convinced that the poet's imagination is a noble gift for the artist; and yet he must not allow himself to be carried away or even to be touched by this longing for imaginative flight when he is on the path of scholarship. The minister may be convinced that there is high value in the materialistic work of the naturalist; and yet his religious attitude must not be shaken by the demand for a godless universe. The ideals of the artist and of the scholar and of the preacher, of the peace reformer and of the warrior are all true ideals, are each worthy to give meaning and significance to the life which is devoted to them. But this significance and this

meaning ultimately lie in the devotion, and the deepest value is therefore lost if the faithful belief in any of these ideals is choked by rival ideals. There is no fitness to win without ~~unity~~ of mind and certainty of purpose.

THE END